DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 092 EC 103 556

AUTHOR	Neumann, Elizabeth M.; Harris, A. Christine
TITLE	Comparisons of Attitudes Toward Mainstreaming Preschool and Kindergarten Children with Special Needs.
SPONS AGENCY	California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	15 Aug 77
GRANT	76-97-AB
NOTE	147p.; The report was prepared by the Casa Colina Hospital for Rehabilitative Medicine
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; Early Childhood Education; Exceptional Child Research; *Handicapped Children; *Parent Attitudes; *Regular Class Placement; Special Education Teachers; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

The attitudes of 206 administrators, teachers, and parents towards programs and teaching techniques for preschool and kindergarten handicapped children were surveyed, with particular emphasis on attitudes regarding mainstreaming. The study focused on two independent variables, the program the respondent was associated with and the role the respondent played in that program. Three types of responses were measured: acceptance of the mainstream concept, views on what constituted effective resource help for mainstreaming, and attitudes towards teaching techniques for the preschool/kindergarten age group. Among findings were that parents were more concerned about the adjustment of handicapped and nonhandicapped child in the mainstream classroom than were educators; that compared to regular educators, special educators were more likely to favor the use of play as an educational tool; and that little discrepancy was found between resource receivers and resource providers in their perceptions of the utility of specific types of resource assistance. (Appended materials, which make up more than half the document, include the following: pilot study questionnaire and information sheet, results of the pilot study, pilot subject response sheet, information consent statement, questionnaire cover sheet, general information sheets, research questionnaire, letters of introduction, and respondent thank you letter.) (SBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED148092

Comparison of Attitudes toward Mainstreaming Preschool and Kindergarten Children with Special Needs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Elizabeth M. Neumann, Ph.D.

Project Director

A. Christine Harris

Research Associate

Prepared under Grant No. 76-97-AB

between the

California State Department of Education

and

Casa Colina Hospital for Rehabilitative Medicine

EC103556

Children's Services Center

Casa Colina Hospital
for Rehabilitative Medicine

August 15, 1977

FOREWORD

Statement of Funding

The study reported here was part of a program of research in Special Education in the Children's Services Center, Casa Colina Hospital for Rehabilitative Medicine.

The study was carried out during the academic year, 1976-1977 under the auspices of the Special Education Research Program, supported by Grant No. 76-97-AB between the State Department of Education and Casa Colina Hospital for Rehabilitative Medicine.

Disclaimer

The full report is reproduced here in this form for distribution as a technical report under the grant, and in order to make complete findings available for others engaged in this research area. Results of this study are the sole responsibility of the investigators. Official endorsement of the California State Department of Education or Casa Colina Hospital for Rehabilitative Medicine is not implied.

Acknowledgements

The researchers wish to express their appreciation to the following people whose interest and assistance made it possible to conduct this study within the required time span. Michael Kleeman designed and implemented the statistical analysis and wrote the description of that process in the Method section. Peggy Seaver assisted with statistical methodology. Barbara Acord contributed to identifying research concerns and relevant populations for the original proposal. Dr. Joseph Gorman consulted with the team on sample selection techniques. The following people worked on coding, tabulating, phoning, and delivery of the questionnaires:

Melissa Devor, Teri Gahre, Dana Hermison, Sonja Moore, Tom Quaney, and Victoria Tucker. Jean Moore coordinated clerical support. The final draft of the report was typed by Meredith Hoffmeyer. Harry J. Neumann and Dr. Robert Harris, the authors' spouses, contributed suggestions and support.

Deepest appreciation goes to the teachers, administrators, and parents from both the pilot and experimental stages of the project for their responsiveness, suggestions, and willingness to share their opinions on programs and techniques for the preschool age handicapped child.

Elizabeth M. Neumann

Elizabeth M. Neumann, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator
August 15, 1977

Christine Harris

Christine Harris
Research Associate
August 15, 1977

ABSTRACT

Purpose

This survey of adults' attitudes towards programs and teaching techniques for preschool and kindergarten handicapped children was designed as action research (Isaac & Michael, 1974). It investigated some of the attitudes and beliefs held by educators and parents relevant to mainstreaming (a current trend toward serving handicapped children in regular classroom settings).

The study focused on the effects of two independent variables on the respondent's attitudes. These independent variables were: 1) the program the respondent was associated with (regular education programs serving handicapped and nonhandicapped children, and special education programs serving the physically handicapped, trainable mentally retarded and the language delayed child); and 2) the role the respondent played in that program (administrator, teacher, parent).

Three types of responses were measured: acceptance of the mainstream concept, views on what constituted effective resource help for mainstreaming, and attitudes towards teaching techniques for this age group.

Results

The following summarizes the results of the questionnaire study:

Mainstream Acceptance

1. Administrators were consistently more favorable toward mainstreaming than were teachers or parents. Of the three groups, parents were least favorable toward mainstreaming.
2. Parents were more concerned about the adjustment of the handicapped and nonhandicapped child in the mainstream classroom than were educators.

3. Staff and parents from regular education programs who were mainstreaming the handicapped had more positive attitudes than respondents from regular education programs which did not include the handicapped.

4. The more normal the child's cognitive/intellectual functioning, the more benefit s/he was felt to derive from the mainstreaming setting.

5. Staff and parents from special education programs for the language delayed were less positive in their view of mainstreaming than respondents from programs for the physically handicapped and trainable mentally retarded.

Preschool Curriculum

1. Compared to regular educators, special educators were more likely to favor the use of play as an educational tool.

Resource Assistance

1. The most useful resource was perceived to be the addition of staff, either part-time in-house aides or consultants.

2. Resources which had the potential for decreasing the amount of teacher-student contact time or for increasing the educators existing workload were judged relatively less useful.

3. Little discrepancy was found between resource receivers (regular educators) and resource providers (administrators and special educators) in their perceptions of the utility of specific types of resource assistance.

The implications of these findings for inservice training, resource support, and for public policy decisions are as follows:

1. Administrators and program planners should provide support for teachers and parents involved in mainstreaming since they will be the adults most intimately involved in the implementation process. They were generally less accepting of the mainstream concept probably because of the restructuring it would require in their approach to education.

2. Mainstream resistance may be exhibited by persons affiliated with programs for the language delayed child. One must be careful not to alienate the language delayed educator in the implementation process.

3. Various types of resource assistance are more likely to be positively viewed if they are perceived to save time and to allow more effective use of educational techniques. It was suggested that the value of inservice training might be approached from this perspective.

4. Since all respondents felt that additional staff in the mainstream classroom was desirable, perhaps positions should be created to fill this perceived need. Part-time aides, regular volunteers, or student interns, and access to consultants and/or resource specialists may take some of the burden of mainstreaming off the educator and may facilitate more positive attitudes toward the process.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Analysis of Variance - General Attitudes towards Mainstreaming (MA-GEN)	21
Table 2	Means for Program Classifications - General Attitudes towards Mainstreaming (MA-GEN)	22
Table 3	Analysis of Variance - Concerns about the Normal Child in the Mainstream Classroom (MA-NORM)	22
Table 4	Analysis of Variance - Concerns about the Normal Child in the Physically Handicapped Classroom, in the Language Delayed Classroom and in the Trainable Mentally Retarded Classroom	23
Table 5	Means Relating to Concerns about the Normal Child in the Mainstream Classroom	24
Table 6	Analysis of Variance - Concerns about the Handicapped Child in the Physically Handicapped Classroom, in the Trainable Mentally Retarded Classroom, and in the Language Delayed Classroom	25
Table 7	Means Relating to Concerns about the Handicapped Child in the Mainstream Classroom	26
Table 8	Analyses of Variance on Miscellaneous Mainstreaming Acceptance Questions (MA-MISC)	27
Table 9	Means Relating to Miscellaneous Mainstream Acceptance Questions (MA-MISC)	28
Table 10	Mean Placement Scores for Different Types of Disabled Children, Ordered by Increasing Acceptance of Mainstreaming	30
Table 11	Analyses of Variance on Independent Curriculum Questions 31, 32, 35, and 57	33
Table 12	Mean Resource Ratings for Regular Education Teachers and for Special Education Teachers and Administrators	34
Table 13	Statistical Clustering of Within Group Resource Ratings	35

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	Pilot Study Questionnaire	46
Appendix B	Pilot Study Information Sheet	56
Appendix C	Results of the Pilot Study	57
Appendix D	Pilot Subject Response Sheet	69
Appendix E	Information Consent Statement	70
Appendix F	Questionnaire Cover Sheet	71
Appendix G	General Information Sheets (Parents, Teachers, and Administrators)	73
Appendix H	Research Questionnaire	75
Appendix I	Administrator's Letter of Introduction	87
Appendix J	Teacher's Letter of Introduction	88
Appendix K	Parent's Letter of Introduction	89
Appendix L	Respondent Thank You Letter	90

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword..... i

Abstract..... iii

List of Tables..... vi

List of Appendices..... vii

Introduction: Historical Overview and Literature Review..... 1

Method..... 8
Statistical Approach/Analysis 17

Data and Results..... 20

Summary/Conclusions/Recommendations..... 36

Bibliography..... 43

Appendices..... 46

INTRODUCTION:

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Current Educational Perspective

Two trends, apparent in current federal and state legislation, focus specifically on the education of the handicapped child under the age of six years. One trend is to provide funding, encouragement, or actual mandates to local agencies to serve this age range. The second is the trend to encourage that special education service to handicapped children of all ages be delivered in "the least restrictive setting" (Public Law 94-142, California State Assembly, 1975, 1976). The least restrictive setting implies serving the child with special educational needs in a regular classroom setting rather than in the segregated special classroom or school (Report of the California Ad Hoc Committee on Early Childhood Special Education, 1977; Reger, 1974a, Time, 1977). This approach is commonly termed mainstreaming (Klein, 1975).

History of the Mainstream Idea

School age settings - In elementary and secondary education settings, the trend in the education of children with special needs has shown a pattern of attempts to utilize "special" settings and "special" teachers. Not only were special settings used for children with moderate and severe retardation (Dunn, 1963), but they were extended to include children whose behavior or learning style resulted in poor school attainment (i.e., the educationally handicapped; Maurer, 1972; Koppitz, 1971; Hewett, 1968).

In the late sixties, there were signs that the trend towards increased segregation of the handicapped child was being questioned. Siegel's (1969) book, "Special education in the regular classroom," suggested techniques for regular classroom teachers to use

with mildly handicapped children. His book antedated the mainstream emphasis that gathered strength in the seventies.

In 1974, Attorney Paul Dimond discussed the legal ramifications of "special" labels that either exclude children from public education or restrict them to "special class placement." He contended that such children were denied equal protection under the law. Since 1974, several authors (Clifford, 1976; Fishman, 1976; Gilhool, 1976; Lortie, 1976; Frein, 1976; Brinegar, 1976; Egbert, 1976) have reviewed pertinent court cases and discussed their implications for education.

During the mid-seventies, the mainstream concept gained popularity (Cleveland & Berkowitz, 1975). An increased amount of material on mainstreaming was published emphasizing practical classroom techniques rather than research findings (Principal's Guide to Mainstreaming, 1975; What is a handicap?, 1976). Edward Martin (1974) reviewed the mainstreaming movement and pointed out possible problems and benefits.

Preschool special education - Special educational programs for children under the traditional school age of six were rare prior to 1960 (cf, Jones, 1974). Early identification of developmental problems was likewise uncommon. Families that were aware of their preschool age child's needs for education to help overcome deficits rarely found special programs available (Engle, 1974).

In 1969, two separate legislative actions increased the amount of interest in special programs for the preschool child with special needs. The first of these was the Developmental Disabilities Act which made funds available to states for services to children with congenital disorders. In California, this mandate has been generally implemented through the Regional Centers for the Developmentally Disabled. With the

cooperation of the state, they have assisted in developing programs for preschool children as part of their general emphasis on providing programs for children who were not already being served by other agencies.

The second federal impetus for preschool special education was the funding of the Handicapped Early Education Projects (HCEEP) under Public Law 91-230, Title VI-C, 1969. Three year demonstration projects were funded throughout the country. Reger (1974b) has reviewed a variety of approaches utilized in preschool education for children with disabilities.

Preschool mainstreaming - Mainstreaming preschool children on a limited basis was unofficially begun in 1965 through the Head Start programs (Klein, 1974). Although these programs were designed to help children from poverty level families receive a preschool background that would facilitate effective learning in later years, the emphasis was on serving "all eligible children." Programs were urged to avoid "labeling" and, in principle, no child was to be excluded because of behavior, learning ability, or physical development. Although the philosophy of total acceptability of all children was not always completely followed at the local level, the general policy did encourage an open attitude on the part of staff and parents toward including handicapped children in Head Start classrooms. A legal basis for this practice was provided in 1972 when Congress mandated Head Start programs to take children with handicaps as 10% of their population (Economic Opportunity Amendments, 1972, Public Law 92-424). The 1972 mandate applied only to Head Start programs. (Brekken et al., 1975). In a survey of other Los Angeles County preschools, Borelich (1974) found that although most directors favored integrating handicapped youngsters, few were doing so to any degree. Interestingly, some administrators felt that their licensing regulations prevented them from taking handicapped children.

Relevance of Adult Attitudes Towards Mainstreaming

In 1973, Schultz studied elementary school age, emotionally disturbed children in a mainstream setting. His research suggested that the main obstacle to success in the regular school setting was more likely to be the teacher's attitude rather than the child's skills and behaviors. Other studies have indicated that the attitudes of teachers and of school administrators are important to the success of mainstream efforts (Schultz, 1973).

In addition to the direct effects adults' attitudes can have on the success of children in mainstream settings, another reason for interest in the views held by adults involves current legislative action. The California Master Plan for Special Education (AB 4040, 1975 and Assembly Bill AB 1250, 1977) calls for a system of "resource and program specialists" to provide support and assistance to the regular classroom teacher. These specialists are either exclusively trained in special education techniques or are trained in both regular and special education methods, usually with emphasis on the latter. However, there seem to be some differences between the two approaches at the preschool and kindergarten grade level. Regular early education programs tend to deemphasize the role of teacher intervention and emphasize the role of the child in actively choosing his/her learning tasks and developing at his/her own rate. In special education, the term "early intervention" implies that the teacher's function is to intervene and to guide the child's learning pattern. Emphasis is on specifying learning objectives, task analysis, and prescriptive teaching.

Curriculum Concerns

With the Head Start experience and the increasing trend towards attempting to serve the handicapped child in mainstream settings, educators have become aware of

differences between the traditional preschool program for the nonhandicapped child and the special education type of program. Shapiro (1976) has pointed out that differences between regular and special educators at the preschool level often involve their attitudes toward the role of the teacher and the types of classroom activities they view as appropriate. In an introduction to a curriculum designed for mainstreaming the preschool handicapped child, Drouin (1977) describes the regular education position as follows:

> Play is the keystone of (traditional) preschool instructional methods. Preschool educators have emphasized that children are active in everything they do, including active watching and active listening. Thus, play is not a frivolous, free time activity; it is the serious business of young children who are exploring, testing, and learning about the world around them. For this reason, early childhood educators aim to facilitate the total growth of young children by providing a wealth of opportunities at appropriate developmental levels. (p. 24)

However, in reviewing curriculum and programs from preschool programs in special education, it is apparent that there is less emphasis on the role of play as a learning tool, more emphasis on teacher-selected goals and objectives for the child, and more emphasis on active intervention by the teacher into the child's activities for the day.

Effective Resource Assistance for the Regular Classroom

In order for administrators to organize and implement effective support services to classrooms integrating handicapped children, it is important that data based information be available assessing the usefulness of resources in assisting the regular teacher in mainstreaming. The range of possible resources is quite broad and may include anything from additional classroom staff support to more abstract assistance like access to computer based information systems. Clearly some resources will be viewed as more appropriate than others and differences in perception may occur between individuals associated with various types of preschool programs.

Research Problem

The main purpose of this research was to assess the extent of differences between study respondents regarding their acceptance of mainstreaming, and their recommendations for preschool curriculum and resource assistance. The original research proposal outlined six research questions and eight working hypotheses. Minor changes were made in the specific hypotheses during the pilot questionnaire stage. Essentially, the research questions specified important contrasts between groups of respondents within the larger sample. Following the original proposal, the population of study respondents was subdivided into the following groups:

1. special educators vs. regular educators;
2. persons with experience with the handicappped vs. those without such experience;
3. parents vs. educators;
4. parents of children with handicaps vs. parents of nonhandicapped children; and
5. resource receivers (teachers in regular education) vs. potential research providers (administrators and special educators).

Hypotheses

The following research questions were addressed in the present study:

A. Acceptance of Mainstreaming

1. Administrators will be more favorable towards mainstreaming than will teachers.
2. Regular education teachers and special education teachers will have similar attitudes towards mainstreaming.
3. Parents of special needs children will be more accepting of mainstreaming than will parents of nonhandicapped children.

4. Programs and individuals having experience with the handicapped child will be more favorable about mainstreaming than will programs and individuals who have had relatively little experience with the handicapped.

B. Curriculum Related Questions

1. Special educators will view the teacher's role as a more active, intervening one than will regular educators.
2. Regular educators will be more favorable towards the role of play as a learning tool than will special educators.
3. Regular educators will be more likely to favor group techniques in the classroom than will special educators.

C. Resource Assistance in the Mainstream Setting

1. Potential resource receivers will differ from potential resource providers on their rating of the utility of possible resources in the mainstream classroom.

Changes in these Hypotheses from the Original Proposal

In the original proposal, assumptions were also made about the degree of knowledge people would have about mainstreaming. However, during the pilot stage it became clear that adding questions about mainstreaming history, legal implications, and techniques would make the questionnaire excessively long and confusing. Thus, these research interests were deferred.

The original hypothesis about curriculum concerns was expanded into three to parallel the actual dimensions included on the final questionnaire.

The original hypothesis comparing current preschool population with educators from older grade levels (as reported in previous studies) was dropped.

METHOD

Overview

A stratified random sample of 206 administrators, teachers, and parents of handicapped and nonhandicapped preschool children participated in the questionnaire study. The instrument was pretested and designed to assess subjects' attitudes relevant to "mainstreaming" the young handicapped child into "regular" classroom settings. Questions dealing specifically with: 1) acceptance of the mainstream approach, 2) curriculum content and style, and 3) classroom resource assistance were identified and pooled into separate attitude indices. The teachers, administrators, and parents were affiliated with either: a) public or private regular education preschool programs, or with b) special education programs serving the physically handicapped, the trainable mentally retarded, or the language delayed (communication disordered) child. Individuals who returned completed questionnaires were given a $10.00 honorarium.

The main purpose of the research was to determine whether teachers, administrators, and parents from special education or regular education differed in any of the three attitude areas.

Subjects

Subjects were randomly drawn from regular preschool and special education programs within a twenty-five mile radius of the Pomona area. Facilities in Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties were contacted. To equalize sample size between experimental cells, it was necessary to contact some special education programs outside of the twenty-five mile limit. These additional areas included Saugus and Orange County. All respondents were involved with programs for the preschool or kindergarten age child.

In total, 62 administrators, 64 teachers, and 80 parents representing 61 preschool programs participated in the study. Within these categories, subjects affiliated with public and private programs designed to serve handicapped or non-handicapped children were asked to participate. Individuals having primary contact with preschool children who were physically disabled, trainable mentally retarded, or language delayed were included in the special education sample.

Within each experimental condition, ten subjects were randomly chosen to participate.

Of the 206 people contacted, two administrators (one in a private program with no experience with the handicapped and one in special education) did not wish to participate, and 42 questionnaires were not returned. When respondents could not be contacted, additional subjects were drawn from the population and asked to participate. The number of unreturned questionnaires and their replacement by cells is summarized in Table 1. All subjects who returned completed questionnaires were sent a $10.00 honorarium which could be endorsed over to a charity if the respondent desired.

Questionnaire Development

Attitudes toward mainstreaming were assessed by subjects' responses to both Likert-scaled and semantic differential questionnaire items.

One hundred thirty-three questions regarding the teacher's role in the classroom, curriculum development, desirable resources, and behavioral objectives in the regular and mainstream classroom were developed. These questions formed the basis of the pilot questionnaire (Appendix A). The current validity of these questions seemed high since they were suggested by the research literature and personal

TABLE 1

SAMPLE DESIGN[1]

Program Category	Respondent's Role			
	Teachers	Administrators	Parents of Handicapped Children	Parents of Nonhandicapped Children
1. SPECIAL EDUCATION:				
(a) Physically Handicapped	12/12	10/9	10/10	X
(b) Trainable Mentally Retarded	10/8	10/7	12/9	X
(c) Language Delayed	11/11	10/8	10/9	X
2. REGULAR EDUCATION:				
(aa) Public Programs, no direct experience with handicapped	10/9	11/11	X	11/11
(bb) Public Programs, with experience with handicapped	11/7	13/9	13/10	10/7
(cc) Private Programs, no direct experience with handicapped	11/8	12/9	X	11/7
(dd) Private Programs, with experience with handicapped	10/9	10/9	10/8	10/9

[1]Cell entries represent: number of respondents contacted/number of questionnaires received.

X = empty cell (by design).

Ten subjects were desired per cell. Where the questionnaire return rate was slow, additional respondents were contacted.

experience in the educational setting.

Two independent judges classified the questionnaire items into three subscales: one on the concept of mainstreaming (MA), one on preschool curriculum (PC), and one on resources desirable in the preschool classroom (R). Each subscale was further divided into clusters of homogeneous questions (see Table 2). The interrater reliability coefficient was .947.

TABLE 2

ORGANIZATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS INTO SUBSCALES

Question Number	Subscale Classification
1-7, 9-21, 23-24, 39-40, 61	Mainstreaming (MA)
8, 16	Attitudes toward children with handicaps
22a-22g	Resources (R)
25-26, 35-36, 42, 54, 58-60	Preschool Curriculum (PC) Individual vs. group approach
27, 28, 30, 33, 34, 37, 41, 43-56, 58, 59	Teacher centered vs. child centered orientation
29	The value of play
31, 32, 38, 57	Independent items

The pilot study. One of the main purposes of the questionnaire was to assess whether respondents held generally favorable or generally unfavorable opinions about mainstreaming the preschool age child. A pilot study was conducted to assess the criterion related validity of the questionnaire. That is, subjects' stated attitudes toward mainstreaming were correlated with their responses to the questionniare items to determine the degree of congruence between their responses and their stated opinions.

An information sheet (Appendix B) about the pilot study was circulated to interested individuals. Included on the information sheet was a place for subjects to indicate, on a dichotomous scale, whether or not they supported the idea of mainstreaming handicapped children into regular classrooms.

Seventy-five completed information sheets were returned from which a sex-balanced sample of twenty respondents (ten who supported mainstreaming and ten who opposed mainstreaming) were randomly selected. The twenty subjects were paid $10.00 for completing the pilot questionnaire.

The data for each item on the pilot questionnaire were analyzed and the results were summarized in individual 2 (sex of respondent, male vs. female) x 2 (original attitude, favorable vs. unfavorable) ANOVA tables and in a correlation matrix. Prior to analysis, it was decided that an item's predictive validity would be established if either of the main effects or the interaction for that item were significant with other questionnaire items. Items with intercorrelations of .90 and beyond were examined for redundancy. The results of the pilot study are summarized in Appendix C.

In addition to answering the questions, respondents were also asked to identify ambiguous items and to offer suggestions for improving the understandability of the instrument (see Appendix D). The major objections to the pilot questionaire were that: a) the age of the target population was not clearly specified, b) definitions or descriptions of the different handicapping conditions should be included, and c) responses to some questions would vary as a function of the nature of the child's handicap (i.e., whether the child was language delayed, physically handicapped, or trainable mentally retarded).

Subjects' suggestions for modifying the questionnaire were taken into account when selecting the format and items for inclusion in the experimental questionnaire. The major difference between the pilot questionnaire and the final instrument involved the response scales. On the final questionnaire, where appropriate, subjects responded to each item on three different scales, one for each of the three types of handicaps studied. In this way, subjects could consider each specific population of handicapped children (i.e., mentally retarded, physically disabled, or language delayed) separately for each questionnaire item. Other changes in the questionnaire suggested by the pilot subjects included using separate general information sheets for parents and education professionals and rewording some questionnaire items and response instructions to improve their clarity.

The final instrument. In its final form, the questionnaire included four components:

1. The Informed Consent Statement
2. The Cover Sheet
3. The General Information Sheet
4. The Questionnaire Items

1. The Informed Consent Statement - To comply with the code of ethical practices adopted by the American Psychological Association in 1963 and amended in 1965 and 1972, a statement informing subjects of the p -pose of the study was included (Appendix E). Measures taken to safeguard the confidentiality of the responses and to protect the anonymity of the study participants were also specified.

2. The Cover Sheet - The cover sheet was included to provide a detailed explanation of the purpose of the study and to define essential terms (Appendix F). In addition, critical information about the target population (age, nature of

handicapping condition) and the research question were made salient.

3. The General Information Sheet - Specific demographic information about the respondent was recorded on the General Information Sheet (Appendix G1). A separate sheet was developed for teachers and administrators and for parents (Appendix G2).

4. The Questionnaire Items - One hundred and five questions comprised the final selection of questionnaire items (Appendix H). Seventy-seven were Likert-scaled questions and twenty-eight were of the bipolar semantic differential type. The majority of the questions measured the degree to which the respondent agreed or disagreed with each of the statements. Agreement and disagreement were assessed on a six-point scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" (1) to "Strongly Disagree" (6). Other six- and eleven-point rating scales were used with questions for which the "Agree-Disagree" poles were inappropriate (see Questions 19, 20, and 50).

In some cases, continuous linear (semantic differential) scales were used where only endpoints were labeled (e.g., "Very useful-Not useful at all," "Very important-Not important," "Very much-Not at all"). Responses on these scales were scored in millimeters.

Finally, on nine items, subjects were given a choice of five alternative responses (see Question 23).

Defining the Populations

Directories of the public school programs were used for locating programs within the twenty-five mile radius. Public phone book "yellow page" listings were used for identifying the private preschool programs.

Preliminary telephone contact. Telephone calls were placed to the administrators of the programs to verify information in the directories. The administrators were briefly told about the purpose of the study and were asked for their cooperation in completing a questionnaire and in supplying some information about their respective programs.

Administrators of special education programs were asked if they supervised any teachers who dealt specifically with physically handicapped, language delayed, or trainable mentally retarded children of preschool or kindergarten age. If such teachers were staff members, the administrators were asked to name these individuals so they might be contacted by the research team.

Administrators of regular education programs were asked if children with disabilities ever participated in their programs and if their staff included teachers who taught kindergarten or preschool age children. The names of programs, administrators, and teachers were compiled into lists from which the sample of study participants would be drawn.

All administrators were told that the responses of the parents of children in the program were sought. Administrators were asked if they would mind if each teacher who completed a questionnaire randomly selected a parent to participate. None of the administrators objected. In fact, many thought this procedure was preferable because it would help safeguard the anonymity of the parents and children associated with the program.

Instructions on how to draw a name randomly were explained on the phone and were included in the cover letter to teachers (see Appendix J). At the close of the

conversation, administrators were thanked for their cooperation and told that a letter would follow describing the project in more detail (see Appendix I for letter).

Administrator and teacher sample. After lists of administrators and teachers had been established, ten study participants were randomly selected for each administrator and teacher cell of the research design (refer to Table 1). In most cases, the entire population of administrators was used, since many program directors and principals, especially of highly specialized curriculum, were at a premium in the area. Most administrators and directors, however, supervised at least one preschool or kindergarten teacher.

The teachers were sent a letter similar to that received by their respective administrators (see Appendix J for letter describing the study). After letters of introduction were received, the questionnaires were either hand delivered by a research assistant or sent through the mail, depending on the wishes of the participant. Special education teachers and teachers of regular classes without handicapped children were given two questionnaires: one for themselves and the other for one of the parents of a child in their program (see Appendix K for parent letter). Teachers in the mainstream programs were given three questionnaires: their own, one for a parent of a nonhandicapped child, and one for the parent of a handicapped child.

Parent sample. Each participating teacher was asked to randomly select one parent (or two, in mainstream settings) to complete a questionnaire. The only restriction was that the parent's child be preschool or kindergarten age. It was recommended that the parent be selected by listing all the children's names on pieces of paper, mixing the papers together and drawing a name "out of the hat." The teacher then

gave the questionnaire to that parent. It was hoped that this procedure would minimize sampling bias.

All questionnaires were accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Completed questionnaires were returned by mail. Within a short time, study participants were sent an honorarium check and a letter of thanks (Appendix L).

Statistical Approach Analysis

Coding the data. Each questionnaire was assigned a unique three-digit identification code indicating the respondent's group membership (as a parent, teacher, or administrator), program affiliation (public or private, regular or special education program), and participant number (1 through 10 for each cell of the design). Responses to each questionnaire item were coded in numerical form for computer analysis. Seven categories were established to identify the educational field in which the respondent received their degree or training. These categories, coded 1 through 7, respectively, were regular education, communications or speech, special education, business, social science (sociology, history, psychology), counseling and nursing, and biological science. The specialty areas within special education were coded 12 (language delayed), 14 (mental retardation), 15 (orthopedic disability), and 17 (sensory-motor impairment).

The Likert-scaled items were coded from 1 ("Strongly Agree" or "Very important") to 6 ("Strongly Disagree" or "Not important"). Responses to semantic differential items were coded in millimeters (1mm to 90mm). Codes for dichotomous variables (i.e., sex, male or female; or yes/no response items) were coded 1 and 2 and 1 and 0, respectively.

Computer Analysis - The coded data were keypunched and cards were key verified for accuracy. The completed card deck was edited and cleaned using a fortran program which checked for deck order, out of range responses, and consistency. The "cleaned" data were then analyzed using the SPSS-10 routine on the DEC-10/KA at the Claremont Colleges, Claremont, California.

The analysis of the data took the following form: Each of the indices and separate items were analyzed in 4 (Role) x 7 (Program classification) analyses of variance. Multiple classification analysis followed, allowing further analysis of the results. Following significance in the overall analysis, questionnaire items were analyzed contrasting the responses of: parents and educators, special and regular educators, respondents experienced and inexperienced in mainstreaming, parents of handicapped and parents of nonhandicapped children, and resource receivers and resource providers. These contrasts were performed separately. To insure the validity of reported significant findings, a conservative probability value of less than .01 was used. This criteria allowed for the "splitting of alpha" to account for the multiple analyses.

The analysis of variance procedure was not used with several items because of their structure. Group preferences for the resource items were analyzed by collapsing across categories to provide two groups of mean ratings for each resource item; one for administrators, and one for teachers. This procedure was carried out by hand using computer-generated cell means. Individual two-tailed *t* tests were then performed to assess within- and between-group significance.

Responses to item 23 (types of educational placements for special needs children) were first analyzed by analysis of variance to determine group differences. For

each placement alternative, a single population mean was calculated. Two-tailed *t* tests were then performed on adjoining pairs of means to determine if significant differences existed in the educational placement of different special needs children. Because multiple *t*'s were performed, only *p* values of less than .01 indicated significance.

The analyses performed were designed before the data was received to conform to the research questions and hypotheses in the original proposal. Additional analyses were performed, among them individual 4 (Role) x 7 (Program affiliation) analyses of variance for each item. These results would allow for later analysis of the data and were not included in the present report except as noted above.

RESULTS

Three separate attitude indices were created from the questionnaire items. These indices dealt specifically with: 1) acceptance of the mainstream approach (MA), 2) preschool curriculum content and style (PC), and 3) classroom resource assistance (R). Separate 4 (Role - teacher, administrator, parent of handicapped child, parent of nonhandicapped child) x 7 (Program - physically handicapped, TMR, LD, public-no experience with the handicapped, public-experience with the handicapped, private-experience with the handicapped, private-no experience with the handicapped) ANOVAS were performed on these data.

Specific contrast groups within the population of respondents included: experience with the handicapped-no experience with the handicapped, parents-school personnel, regular educators-special educators, parents of handicapped children-parents of nonhandicapped children.

Mainstream Acceptance (MA)

The subgroup of questions assessing acceptance of mainstreaming were further subdivided into four groups: 1) general acceptance of mainstreaming (MA-GEN), 2) the effect of mainstreaming on the "normal" child in the classroom (MA-NORM), 3) the effect of mainstreaming on the handicapped child in the classroom (MA-HANCPD), and 4) miscellaneous items on mainstreaming (MA-MISC).

On all mainstream acceptance indices, the higher the score the more the respondent favors a mainstream approach.

General Acceptance (MA-GEN) - The analysis of these data (Table 1) revealed significant differences in the general acceptance of the mainstream approach among teachers, administrators, and parents ($F(3,183)=7.22$, $p<.001$) and among programs serving the preschool child ($F(6,183)=3.63$, $p.< 002$). The range of scores on the scale was from 20 (extremely negative) to 120 (extremely positive). As hypothesized, school administrators were the most accepting of mainstreaming (mean: 100.69), while the parents of handicapped children were the least accepting (mean: 85.68). The reactions of parents of nonhandicapped children were also quite negative (mean: 87.44), while as a whole, teachers were ambivalent about the mainstream approach (mean: 92.48).

TABLE 1

Analysis of Variance - General Attitudes Towards Mainstreaming (MA-GEN)

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Role (R)	7018.78	3	2339.59	7.22	.001
Program (P)	7070.26	6	1178.38	3.63	.002
R x P	2272.75	13	174.83	<1	
Error	59342.35	183	324.28		

Contact with the handicapped child seemed to promote positive feelings toward mainstreaming among specialized programs (see Table 2 for means). Both public and private programs having experience with the handicapped were quite supportive of mainstreaming (means: 98.89 and 99.09, respectively). On the other hand, individuals associated with programs exclusively serving nonhandicapped children and with programs for the language delayed child felt less favorable about the mainstream approach (see Table 2 for means). The expected difference between parents of handicapped children and parents of nonhandicapped children in their general acceptance of the mainstream approach did not reach statistical significance, although the means are in the predicted direction (means: 87.98 and 86.86, respectively; $F(1,71)<1$). As predicted,

regular and special education teachers had similar overall acceptance scores regarding mainstreaming (means: 92.89 and 92.17, respectively; $F(1,199) < 1$).

TABLE 2

Means for Program Classifications
General Attitudes Towards Mainstreaming (MA-GEN)[1]

Program	Mean
Physically handicapped	96.38
Trainable mentally retarded	93.4
Language delayed	86.57
Public programs	
no experience with handicapped	86.93
experience with handicapped	98.89
Private programs	
no experience with handicapped	83.18
experience with handicapped	99.09

[1]Scores ranged from 10 (very unfavorable) to 120 (very favorable).

The "Normal" Child in the Mainstream Classroom (MA-NORM) - Evaluating the effectiveness of mainstreaming involves assessing the extent to which the child may benefit from such a setting. The mainstream classroom may be the child's first experience with peers who may look or behave differently. Significant differences were found between respondent groups (Table 3, $F(3,183)=7.28$, $p < .001$) and among preschool programs (Table 3, $F(6,183)=4.60$, $p < .001$) regarding their concerns about the ability of the normal child to function in the mainstream setting.

TABLE 3

Analysis of Variance - Concerns about the Normal Child
in the Mainstream Classroom (MA-NORM)

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Role (R)	18419.59	3	6139.86	7.28	.001
Program (P)	23273.65	6	3878.94	4.60	.001
R x P	12262.16	13	943.24	1.12	.35
Error	154291.68	183	843.12		

These significant effects were partitioned into three components, one for each of the special needs categories (physically handicapped, trainable mentally retarded, and language delayed). The results of the analysis of variance performed on these data are summarized in Table 4. The means are presented in Table 5. Examination of Table 4 reveals that the effects are parallel across the three special needs categories. As one might expect, compared to school personnel, parents expressed relatively more concern about placing a nonhandicapped child in the mainstream classroom (see Table 5 for means, $F(1,106)=11.09$, $p < .001$). Across special needs categories, placement of a normal child with language delayed peers appeared to arouse relatively less concern than the integration of the normal child with TMR or physically handicapped peers.

TABLE 4

Analysis of Variance - Concerns about the Normal Child in the. . . .

Physically Handicapped Classroom					
Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Role (R)	1343.84	3	447.95	5.83	.001
Program (P)	1264.32	6	210.72	2.74	.014
R x P	1021.64	13	78.59	1.02	.43
Error	14069.57	183	76.88		

Language Delayed Classroom					
Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Role (R)	2286.38	3	762.13	7.00	.001
Program (P)	2033.95	6	338.99	3.11	.006
R x P	1398.36	13	107.57	<1	--
Error	19923.98	183	108.87		

Trainable Mentally Retarded Classroom					
Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Role (R)	2672.36	3	890.79	6.16	.001
Program (P)	5666.31	6	944.39	6.53	.001
R x P	2619.15	13	201.47	1.39	.17
Error	26454.19	183	144.56		

TABLE 5

Means Relating to Concerns about the Normal Child in the Mainstream Classroom[1]

	Special Needs Category		
	PH	LD	TMR
Role Classification			
Teacher	45.5	54.42	49.27
Administrator	46.17	55.58	49.23
Parent of Handicapped	40.41	48.53	42.28
Parent of Nonhandicapped	40.74	47.62	41.11
Program Classification			
Physically Handicapped	45.37	53.47	47.34
Trainable Mentally Retarded	43.28	51.82	48.38
Language Delayed	41.12	48.97	41.91
Public Program			
No experience with handicapped	41.08	49.91	40.69
Experience with handicapped	44.37	54.97	51.45
Private Program			
No experience with handicapped	41.66	48.88	38.14
Experience with handicapped	48.12	57.25	53.47

[1]Scores ranged from 10 (extremely concerned) to 60 (not at all concerned).

In general, respondents having experience with handicapped children were significantly less concerned about the placement of a "normal" child in the mainstream classroom than were respondents having limited experience with the handicapped (means: 147.39 and 128.84, respectively; $(F(1,199)=13.66, p < .001)$. Special educators and regular educators did not differ significantly in their concern for the nonhandicapped child in the integrated setting (means: 139.74 and 144.31, respectively; $F(1,199) < 1$). There was no significant overall difference in the degree to which parents of handicapped children and parents of nonhandicapped children favored a mainstream approach for normal preschoolers (means: 134.85 and 127.87, respectively; $F(1,71) < 1$).

The Handicapped Child in the Mainstream Classroom (MA-HANCPD) - Concern was also expressed for the handicapped child who may share a class with nonhandicapped peers. Summary tables and means for the 2x2 analyses of variance calculated for each special needs category are contrasted in Tables 6 and 7, respectively. Parallel significant main effects for role and program (Table 6) indicate a certain consistency of opinion across conditions. An examination of the means (Table 7) suggests that compared to teachers and administrators, parents are relatively more apprehensive about the effects of the mainstream class on the handicapped child (means: 45.23 and 38.2, respectively; $F(1,192)=14.63$, $p<.001$). Of interest is the overall finding that teachers feel trainable mentally retarded children may be less likely to profit from the mainstream process than either the physically handicapped or language delayed child.

TABLE 6

Analysis of Variance - Concerns about the Handicapped Child in the. . . .

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Physically Handicapped Classroom					
Role (R)	492.47	3	164.58	5.9	.001
Program (P)	341.33	6	56.88	2.0	.06
R x P	328.93	13	25.30	<1	--
Error	5094.70	183	50.41		
Trainable Mentally Retarded Classroom					
Role (R)	493.42	3	164.47	5.5	.001
Program (P)	1312.37	6	218.72	7.31	.001
R x P	462.34	13	35.57	1.19	.29
Error	5478.21	183	29.94		
Language Delayed Classroom					
Role (R)	543.77	3	181.26	5.95	.001
Program (P)	430.50	6	71.75	2.36	.03
R x P	248.84	13	19.14	<1	--
Error	5571.34	183	30.44		

TABLE 7

Means Relating to Concerns about the Handicapped Child in the Mainstream Classroom[1]

	Special Needs Category		
	PH	TMR	LD
Role Classification			
Teacher	16.11	11.71	14.91
Administrator	17.83	14.03	16.97
Parent of Handicapped	14.43	9.97	13.16
Parent of Nonhandicapped	13.67	10.68	12.79
Program Classification			
Physically Handicapped	16.75	13.06	15.11
Trainable Mentally Retarded	15.24	12.82	15.31
Language Delayed	13.61	9.03	12.57
Public Program			
No experience with handicapped	15.8	10.06	14.13
Experience with handicapped	15.75	13.79	15.79
Private Program			
No experience with handicapped	15.05	7.44	12.85
Experience with handicapped	17.96	15.14	16.9

[1]Scores ranged from 3 (extremely concerned) to 18 (not at all concerned).

Compared to other programs, persons associated with programs expressly for the physically handicapped or with private programs who have had experience with the handicapped child feel relatively more confident that children with physical disabilities can benefit from mainstreaming (means: 38.6 and 43.92, respectively; $F(1,199)=6.78$, $p<.001$). Regarding the effect of mainstreaming on the trainable mentally retarded and language delayed child, individuals who have had contact with children with disabilities (with the exception of those associated with language delayed programs) feel more confident that the "special" child can benefit in a mainstream setting. No significant differences existed between parents of handicapped children and parents of nonhandicapped children in their concern for the "special" child in the mainstream classroom (means: 38.76 and 37.44, respectively; $F(1,71)<1$).

Miscellaneous Items on Acceptance of Handicapping Conditions (MA-MISC) - It did not seem appropriate to classify three of the questionnaire items into any of the three dimensions described above. Subjects' responses to each item have been analyzed separately and the results are presented in Tables 8 and 9 (analyses of variance and means, respectively).

TABLE 8

Analyses of Variance on Miscellaneous Mainstreaming Acceptance Questions (MA-MISC)

Question 3

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Role (R)	43.88	3	14.63	4.84	.003
Program (P)	76.197	6	12.70	4.21	.001
R x P	56.72	13	1.45	<1	
Error	543.66	180	3.02		

Question 4j

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Role (R)	4.19	3	1.40	<1	--
Program (P)	18.49	6	3.08	1.45	.20
R x P	22.74	13	1.75	<1	--
Error	376.34	177	2.13		

Question 7

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Role (R)	8.25	3	2.75	2.41	.07
Program (P)	25.96	6	4.33	3.79	.001
R x P	20.08	13	1.55	1.36	.19
Error	202.95	178	1.14		

TABLE 9

Means Relating to Miscellaneous Mainstream Acceptance Questions (MA-MISC)[1]

	Question 3	Question 4j	Question 7
Role Classification			
Teacher	3.73	1.86	5.71
Administrator	4.36	2.13	5.49
Parent of Handicapped	3.01	1.88	5.33
Parent of Nonhandicapped	3.79	1.71	5.12
Program Classification			
Physically Handicapped	4.18	2.33	5.67
Trainable Mentally Retarded	3.58	2.18	5.18
Language Delayed	3.88	1.42	5.29
Public Program			
No experience with handicapped	3.1	1.71	5.4
Experience with handicapped	4.6	2.11	5.74
Private Program			
No experience with handicapped	2.53	1.57	4.7
Experience with handicapped	4.11	1.99	5.89

[1]Scores on these measures ranged from 1 (strongly agree) to 6 (strongly disagree).

Question 3 asserts, "Only handicapped children with normal intelligence should be educated in the regular classrooms of the public schools." An examination of the means relating to the significant role (Table 8, Question 3, $F(3,180)=4.84$, $p < .003$) and program main effects (Table 8, Question 3, $F(6,180)=4.21$, $p < .001$) pinpoint differences of opinion on this issue (see Table 9). While teachers, parents of the handicapped child, and parents of the nonhandicapped child agree that only handicapped children with normal mental capabilities should be mainstreamed (means: 3.73, 3.01, and 3.79, respectively); administrators disagree with this stipulation (mean: 4.36). Respondents having contact with children with disabilities were more likely to disagree with the question than were respondents from programs which did not routinely accept handicapped children (means: 4.11 and 2.82, respectively;

$F(1,192)=17.5$, $p<.001$). The opinions of special educators and regular educators did not differ on this issue (means: 3.86 and 3.71, respectively; $F(1,192)<1$).

Question 4j addresses the need for additional staff in mainstream classrooms. No significant differences among groups were found (see Table 8, Question 4j).

The training of teachers who function in the integrated setting (Question 7) is an issue that created sharp differences between groups (see Table 8, Question 7). A comparison of means for role classification indicated that parents of handicapped and nonhandicapped children favor special training to qualify educators to teach the handicapped child (means: 5.33 and 5.12, respectively), while school personnel felt less strongly that such training is necessary (means: administrators, 5.71; and teachers, 5.49; $F(1,185)=6.4$, $p<.012$). Regular and special educators did not differ in their opinions regarding special teacher training (means: 5.52 and 5.39, respectively; $F(1,192)<1$). But compared to individuals having experience with the handicapped, persons without such experience felt that special training is desirable (means: 5.6 and 5.11, respectively; $F(1,192)=6.22$, $p<.013$).

Educational Placement of Special Needs Children - Respondents were asked to indicate the type of educational arrangement best suited to various types of handicapped children. The placement choices ranged from total segregation of the child in a separate, special school to assignment of the child to a classroom where handicapped and nonhandicapped children received the same educational material. Table 10 displays the mean placement scores for this measure. The findings indicate that the severely mentally retarded are the least acceptable candidates for mainstreaming while children with mild learning disabilities are best suited to a mainstream setting.

TABLE 10

Mean Placement Scores for Different Types of Disabled Children, Ordered by Increasing Acceptance of Mainstreaming

Level[3]	Disability Type	Mean Placement Score[1,2]
1.	Severely Mentally Retarded	1.69
2.	Autistic	2.19
3.	Emotionally Disturbed Child	2.57
4.	Trainable Mentally Retarded Child	2.79
5.	Child with Hearing Impairment Child with Speech Problems	3.44
6.	Child with a Visual Handicap Child with a Physical Handicap	3.73
7.	Mild Learning Disabilities	3.91

[1]The possible responses to this question included the following:

1 - a separate, special school
2 - a special school that shares a site with a regular school
3 - a special classroom in a regular school
4 - a classroom with both handicapped and nonhandicapped children where the handicapped children receive some special assistance
5 - a classroom where handicapped and nonhandicapped children receive the same educational material

[2]The higher the mean, the more the placement reflects a mainstream orientation.

[3]Significant differences ($p < .05$) were found between each level of disability type.

It is interesting to note that autistic children were perceived to require a more sheltered educational environment than children with other types of handicaps. In general, the more "normal" the child's cognitive-intellectual abilities, the more likely that a mainstream setting would be recommended (Table 10, compare disability types 1-4 with disability types 5-7).

No significant differences were found between the educational needs of children with hearing impairments or speech problems ($t(202)=.22$, $p<.83$), and children with visual or physical handicaps ($t(203)=.70$, $p<.49$).

Preschool Curriculum

The curriculum of the preschool classroom is an issue of concern to parents and school personnel alike. Several questions relating to curriculum content and style were included in the questionnaire (refer to Table 2). These items have been subdivided into three categories: one focusing on emphasis on the individual or the group in the classroom (PC-I vs. G), one contrasting a teacher-centered and a child-centered orientation (PC-T vs. C), and the last assessing the value of play (PC-P). Four items which did not seem to address any of the above issues will be examined independently (PC-MISC).

Relatively higher scores on these measures reflect support of: a) a group rather than an individualistic approach; b) a teacher-centered rather than a child-centered environment; and c) play as a positive educational tool.

Individual vs. Group Emphasis (PC-I vs. G) - The hypothesis that regular educators would tend to favor group techniques while special educators would emphasize individual techniques was not supported by the data (means: 17.1 and 16.23, respectively; $F(1,199)=1.52$, $p<.22$). No significant difference in group vs. individual orientation was found between persons having experience with the handicapped and those who have not (means: 16.97 and 16.14; $F(1,199)=1.16$, $p<.28$), between parents and educators (means: 15.78 and 16.94, respectively; $F(1,106)=1.71$, $p<.19$), or between parents of handicapped and nonhandicapped children (means: 15.79 and 15.21, respectively; $F(1,71)<1$).

Teacher-centered vs. Child-centered Classroom Orientation (PC-T vs. C) - The predicted difference in the orientation of special educators and regular educators was not found (means: 75.56 and 88.66, respectively; $F(1,199) < 1$). However, as one might expect, educators tended to favor a teacher-centered approach while parents preferred that the child take a more active role in the education process (means: 105.97 and 20.64, respectively; $F(1,106)=18.69$, $p < .001$).

Play as an Educational Tool (PC-P) - A significant difference was revealed between regular and special educators regarding their feelings about the usefulness of play in the preschool curriculum (means: 0.61 and 1.58, respectively; $F(1,199)=7.97$, $p < .005$). Contrary to hypothesis, special education teachers felt significantly more favorable about play as an aid to learning than did regular educators. Parallel differences were found between educators and parents where the latter group felt significantly more positive about the function of play in the classroom (means: 0.24 and 1.61, respectively; $F(1,106)=10.82$, $p < .002$).

Miscellaneous Curriculum Questions (PC-MISC) - Results of the analyses of variance performed on the data from the four independent curriculum questions are presented in Table 11. Statistical significance was achieved among treatment groups only on question 57 ("Homework or take home projects are inappropriate."). Teachers were more likely to agree with this statment than were administrators (means: 3.88 and 4.35, respectively; $F(1,121)=2.73$, $p < .10$). No difference was found between the opinions of regular and special educators (means: 4.11 and 4.11; $F(1,121) < 1$).

TABLE 11

Analyses of Variance on Independent Curriculum Questions 31, 32, 35, and 57[1]

Question 31: "Thinking and learning will be enhanced by exposure to a wide variety of materials, equipment and activities."

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Role (R)	1.06	3	0.35	<1	--
Program (P)	2.96	6	0.49	<1	--
R x P	5.47	13	0.42	<1	--
Error	91.21	180	0.50		

Question 32: "Parents should be directly involved in their child's education at school through parent volunteer programs."

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Role (R)	1.35	3	0.45	<1	--
Program (P)	4.04	6	0.67	1.0	--
R x P	4.22	13	0.32	<1	
Error	121.13	180	0.67		

Question 35: "The experiences that the young child has with his/her first classroom will profoundly affect his/her growth and attitude toward later schooling."

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Role (R)	1.32	3	0.44	<1	--
Program (P)	7.36	6	1.23	<1	
R x P	26.26	13	2.02	1.59	.09
Error	228.83	180	1.27		

Question 57: "Homework or take home projects are inappropriate."

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Role (R)	21.24	3	7.08	3.14	.027
Program (P)	17.95	6	2.99	1.33	.25
R x P	55.98	13	4.31	1.91	.032
Error	386.20	171	2.26		

[1]Scores ranged from 1 (strongly agree) to 6 (strongly disagree).

Resource Assistance

Respondents were asked to rate the usefulness of seven possible resources for helping to teach handicapped children in the regular classroom. Mean usefulness ratings are presented in Table 12. Contrary to prediction, the relative ranking of potential resource providers (administrators and special educators) and potential resource receivers (regular educators) were virtually identical. All respondents felt that an aide or an assistant teacher would be the most useful resource. There was general agreement that access to a computer connected information system would be the least helpful. In nearly every instance, regular educators felt the proposed resource was potentially more useful than did special education teachers and administrators (see Table 12 for t values between respondent groups).

TABLE 12

Mean Resource Ratings for Regular Education Teachers and for Special Education Teachers and Administrators[1]

Resource	Resource Receiver (regular educators)	Resource Provider (special teachers & administrators)	t value	p
1. Aide or assistant teacher	3.28	2.42	0.80	---
2. In-house resource teacher	7.76	6.11	0.58	---
3. Program specialist consultant	8.47	12.88	8.48	.001
4. Regular newsletter	11.69	20.02 (5)	4.65	.001
5. Extra library material	12.96	18.14 (4)	3.52	.001
6. Bibliography of library resource materials	15.94	21.51	7.53	.001
7. Computerized information system	17.13	32.48	8.43	.001

[1]Scores ranged from 1 (very useful) to 89 (not useful at all).

Within each respondent group, ratings seemed to cluster into three sets (Table 13). Resource providers and resource receivers rated assistant teachers, in-house resource teachers and program specialist consultants as equally useful and highly desirable compared to other forms of assistance ($\underline{t}(64)=3.01$, $p < .005$; and $\underline{t}(183)=3.76$, $p < .001$, respectively). The availability of a regular newsletter and extra library materials were ranked by both groups as moderately desirable and equally useful (resource receivers, $\underline{t}(64) < 1$; and resource providers, $\underline{t}(183) < 1$).

Regular education teachers (resource receivers) perceived no significant difference between the utility of a computerized information system and a bibliography of library resource materials ($\underline{t}(63) < 1$). Both of these resources were rated significantly less useful than the other potential classroom aids ($\underline{t}(64)=6.08$, $p < .001$).

The only point of difference between resource receivers and providers came in their assessment of the usefulness of a bibliography of library resource materials. Resource providers felt this aid was significantly more useful than resource receivers ($\underline{t}(124)=7.53$, $p < .001$).

TABLE 13

Statistical Clustering of Within Group Resource Ratings[1]

	Resource	Resource Receivers Grand Mean		Resource	Resource Providers Grand Mean
1.	Aide/assistant teacher In-house resource teacher Program specialist	6.5	1.	Aide/assistant teacher In-house resource teacher Program specialist	7.14
2.	Regular newsletter Extra library material	12.33	2.	Extra library material Regular newsletter Bibliography	19.89
3.	Bibliography Computerized information	16.54	3.	Computerized information	32.48

[1]Scores ranged from 1 (very useful) to 89 (not useful at all).

SUMMARY/CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Acceptance of Mainstreaming

Review of Results

Effect of role of respondent - The respondent's role significantly influenced their acceptance of the mainstream concept. Mainstream acceptance became weaker as one moved from administrators to teachers to parents. This result was found concerning both general acceptance of mainstreaming (MA-GEN) and concerns for the handicapped child in the regular classroom setting (MA-HANCPD). For the index of concerns about the effects of mainstreaming on the nonhandicapped child (MA-NORM), teachers joined administrators in their positive acceptance, while parents of handicapped and nonhandicapped children expressed concern about the effects of mainstreaming on the normal child.

On the miscellaneous question referring to "normal intelligence" as a requirement for successful mainstreaming, administrators continued in their pattern of mainstream acceptance by disagreeing with this statement. Although teachers and the parents of the nonhandicapped were rather ambivalent, the parents of handicapped children agreed that mainstream participation should be restricted to children with normal intelligence.

Effect of the respondent's program - The program that the respondent was associated with, either as a staff member or as a parent of a child, also significantly affected their attitude toward mainstream acceptance. On the general acceptance index (MA-GEN), respondents who were the most favorable were from public or private regular education programs having experience with mainstreaming. On the other hand, respondents from public and private regular education programs who had not yet mainstreamed handicapped children were relatively less accepting of the mainstream concept.

Respondents from special education programs for the physically handicapped and the trainable mentally retarded indicated moderate acceptance of mainstreaming. One special education group (respondents connected with programs for the language delayed, communication disordered, or aphasic) joined the non-mainstreaming regular educators in their relatively lower acceptance of the mainstream concept.

Discussion

Role effects - Regarding respondents' role, it appears that the closer one is to the legislative mandates and the possible availability of funds, the more favorable one is toward the mainstreaming concept. However, at this time, teachers are less favorable about the mainstream process. Their attitudes seem well-founded because it is they who will be required to actually implement classroom mainstreaming.

They will also have to adjust to shifts in responsibility within their respective settings to accommodate this new process. For administrators, a positive attitude toward mainstreaming will likely be rewarded given current legislative trends. For teachers, rewards may be long in coming since the immediate effects of mainstreaming will be the more negative ones of required changes in technique and workload.

Parents reflected even more concern than teachers, despite the fact that much of the emphasis on mainstreaming stems from active parent organizations and their advocacy efforts. The average parent in the present sample appeared to react more to concerns about how these changes would affect children rather than how these changes would benefit society, promote human rights, and generally serve a greater good.

Effects of experience with mainstreaming - The hypothesis that mainstream experience would lead to more favorable attitudes toward mainstreaming was confirmed. The act

of mainstreaming itself may have been positive enough to facilitate a significant increase in mainstream acceptance.

Program effects for the language delayed child - The apparent lack of acceptance of mainstreaming by respondents from special programs for the language delayed was surprising compared with other respondents' assessment of the appropriate use of mainstream techniques with the language delayed child. The patterns of acceptance for questions directly relating to the language delayed child were similar to those found for the physically handicapped child and almost as positive. Indeed, mainstreaming was judged significantly more appropriate for the language delayed child than for the trainable mentally retarded child.

The lack of mainstream enthusiasm by respondents from language delayed programs may be due to the nature of these programs in the Southern California area. These programs, often titled programs for the communication disordered or for the aphasic, have a low teacher-student ratio and typically have students who do not manifest severe behavior disorders. This workload allows for much individual attention for the students. In addition, as special programs for the autistic and the emotionally disturbed develop, language delayed programs appear to be enrolling more children who are nonhandicapped in appearance, behavior, and nonverbal learning skills. Therefore, it appears that educators or parents associated with the language delayed programs are unwilling to risk losing these advantages, particularly when the children in these programs are viewed as handicapped and socialization with the "normal" child is not much of an advantage.

Recommended Placement of Special Needs Children

Comparisons between handicapped groups - In a separate subset of questions, respondents

indicated their preferred placement for children with one of nine handicapping conditions. These responses were not analyzed for the effect of respondent's role or program. The nine categories clustered into seven separate groups, with significant differences between these seven classifications. These groups, arranged in order of increasing acceptance of the regular classroom as the preferred alternative, were: 1) severely mentally retarded (least acceptable for the mainstream placement, 2) autistic, 3) emotionally disturbed, 4) trainable mentally retarded, 5) hearing impaired or language disabled, 6) visually handicapped or physically handicapped, and 7) mild learning disabled (most acceptable for the mainstream placement).

Discussion - Of all groups, the child with mild learning disabilities was seen as best served by a regular classroom placement (mean rating = 3.91; a rating of 3 corresponded to placement in a special classroom, a rating of 4 corresponded to placement in a regular class where special assistance was available). Children with orthopedic and visual handicaps were also judged as appropriate candidates for a mainstream setting (mean = 3.73). However, respondents felt that a special school either separately situated or on a regular school site would be preferred placement for the severely mentally retarded or the autistic child.

Implications

In planning the use of "least restrictive environments," one will need to consider more than general attitudes of staff and parents toward the mainstream concept. Significant differences also existed in the perception of children with various handicaps. Children with physical handicaps appeared to be more acceptable in the mainstream setting than children with handicaps directly affecting their ability to learn or to interact socially. The only exception was that children with mild learning disabilities were anticipated to benefit from the regular classroom.

Review of Results

Effects of program and role - The hypothesized differences between special educators and regular educators in their views on: 1) the teacher's role, 2) group vs. individual instruction, and 3) the appropriateness of play in the classroom curriculum were not found. All respondents desired a combination of child-centered and teacher-directed activities, using both individual and group methods of instruction. There was a significant difference between special and regular educators on the play dimension; however, it was contrary to prediction since special educators were found to view play more positively than regular educators.

The opinions of parents did differ from educators on the above dimensions. Parents tended to favor a more active role for the child in the classroom and felt that play was appropriate in the preschool curriculum.

Discussion - Anecdotal evidence, comments in the literature, and a review of teaching manuals indicates that compared to regular educators, special educators are taught to emphasize teacher-directed activities and to deemphasize the use of play in the classroom. However, the effects of this training were not apparent in the findings. In fact, it was the special educators who supported play as a legitimate learning tool. It may be that regular educators do not focus on the learning potential of play because they may assume that children without handicaps have already mastered, at some level, effective play techniques and the kinds of skills that are generally taught in playtime settings (e.g., motor skills, communication, and social interaction). Developmentally, nonhandicapped children may therefore be ready to learn skills generally taught by nonplay techniques (shape recognition, letter sounds, number concepts, etc.).

Resource Assistance

Review of Results

All respondents rated the usefulness of seven different types of resource assistance. It was hypothesized that potential resource providers (special education teachers and administrators) would differ from potential resource receivers (regular educators) in their perceived usefulness of the resources. Instead, a parallel trend emerged for both groups. Resource assistance that appeared to save time and energy for the teachers (i.e., part-time aides and consultants) was rated from moderately to extremely useful. Resources that may require additional teacher time were viewed as less useful. Teachers ranked the following resources in decreasing order of utility: 1) regular newsletter on mainstream techniques (rated most useful of this group), 2) bibliography on library material, and 3) computerized information systems (rated least useful of this group). Potential resource providers differed from potential resource receivers only one dimension. Providers felt that a bibliography of library materials was significantly more useful than did resource receivers.

Discussion

With the exception of perceived usefulness of a library bibliography, it appears that individuals who will likely be planning and providing mainstream assistance and teachers involved in mainstreaming share similar views on the utility of resource materials. Although the topic of inservice training was not included, such education may be viewed as more acceptable if it emphasizes future time savings through the more effective use of current resources and techniques.

Information conversations with the respondents revealed that many viewed the resource consultant as one who worked directly on the child's prescription or with the child him/herself. There was high general favorability of "an extra pair of hands" and all

respondents agreed that teaching assistants would be needed in mainstream classrooms.

A related question addressed the need for mainstream teachers to receive special training. All groups of respondents felt such training was necessary, although persons associated with private programs having no mainstream experience felt relatively less strongly about this issue. In addition, it was found that parents felt more strongly than educators that special training should be required.

Summary

The general feeling towards mainstreaming appears favorable with the hypothesized differences between role groups confirmed. On most mainstreaming measures, administrators were more accepting than teachers, and they in turn were generally more accepting than parents. Parents of handicapped and parents of nonhandicapped children usually agreed on their general acceptance ratings.

One of the most encouraging findings was that, as predicted, regular educators who had tried mainstreaming were more favorable than those who had not. This was true for both public and private school settings.

The only difference between special educators and regular educators regarding curriculum concerns involved the use of play in the classroom. Special educators regarded play as a more useful tool than did regular educators.

Little substantial difference existed between resource receivers and resource providers on usefulness of mainstream classroom aids.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Assembly Bill (AB) 4040 enacted as a master plan for special education, California State Legislature, Sacramento, Ca., 1975.

Assembly Bill (AB) 1250, in process as a revised master plan for special education, California State Legislature, Sacramento, Ca., 1977.

Brekken, L., Drouin, C., & Tereda, S. The handicapped in Head start. Unpublished manuscript. Department of Education, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, Ca., May, 1975.

Brinegar, L. Discussion of Gilhool's Changing public policies: Roots and forces. In Mainstreaming: Origins and implications. College of Education, University of Minnesota, Spring, 1976, 2, 2, 2-22.

Cleveland, J. O., & Berkowitz, A. J. Educational implications. In R. M. Peterson & J. O. Cleveland (Eds). Medical problems in the classroom. Springfield, Ill.: 1975.

Clifford, G. J. Discussion of Gilhool's Changing public policies: Roots and forces. In Mainstreaming: Origins and implications. College of Education, University of Minnesota, Spring, 1976, 2, 2, 2-22.

D-day for the disabled. Time, May 30, 1974, p. 44.

Dimond, P. The constitutional right to an education: The quiet revolution. Hastings Law Journal, 24, 1973, 1087-1127.

Drouin, C. The competency curriculum approach: Manual and guide. Manuscript submitted for publication, 1977. Available from Children's Services Center, Casa Colina Hospital, 255 E. Bonita, Pomona, Ca.

Dunn, L. M. Exceptional children in the schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1963.

Engel, R. C. A normal early childhood program for children with special needs. In E. M. Neumann & E. H. Williams (Eds). Distinguished lecture series in special education and rehabilitation (Twelfth annual). Los Angeles, Ca.: School of Education, University of Southern California, 1974.

Fishman, D. J. Education of the handicapped: Toward equal opportunity under the law. Unpublished manuscript, Education Department, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, Ca., Spring, 1975.

Frein, J. B. Discussion of Gilhool's Changing public policies: Roots and forces. In Mainstreaming: Origins and implications. College of Education, University of Minnesota, Spring, 1976, 2, 2, 2-22.

Gilhool, T. Changing public policies: Roots and forces. In Mainstreaming: Origins and Implications. College of Education, University of Minnesota, Spring, 1976, 2, 2, 2-22.

Hewett, F. M. The emotionally disturbed child in the classroom. Boston, Mass.: Allyn & Bacon, 1968.

Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. Handbook in research and evaluation. San Diego, Ca.: Edits publishers, 1976.

Jones, M. H. A new look at toddlers. In E. M. Neumann & E. H. Williams (Eds). Distinguished lecture series in special education and rehabilitation (Twelfth annual). Los Angeles, Ca.: School of Education, University of Southern California, 1974.

Klein, J. W. Mainstreaming the preschooler. Young Children, July, 1975, 317-326.

Koppitz, E. M. Children with learning disabilities: A five year follow-up study. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1971.

Lortie, D. C. Discussion of Gilhool's Changing public policies: Roots and forces. Mainstreaming: Origins and implications. College of Education, University of Minnesota, Spring, 1976, 2, 2, 2-22.

Martin, E. W. Some thoughts on mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, November, 1974, 150-153.

Maurer, A. What ever happened to witches? Journal of School Psychology, 1972, 10, 2, 109-111.

OCD-HS Head Start Policy Manual: Head Start Performance Standards, OCD Notice N-3C 364-1, OCD/HEW, January, 1973.

Public Law (PL) 94-142 94th Congress of the United States, S6, November, 29, 1975. 89 Stat. 796.

Public Law (PL) 94-142. Regulations. Federal Register, December 30, 1976.

Principal's Guide to Mainstreaming. Bureau of Business Practice, Inc. Waterford, Conn.: Croft-NEI Publications, 1975.

Reger, R. What does mainstreaming mean? Journal of Learning Disabilities, October, 1974, 57-59.

Reger, R. Preschool programming of children with learning disabilities. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1974 (b)

Report on Guidelines from the ad hoc Committee on Preschool special Education. Draft 2. D. Keeny (Chair). California State Department of Education, 1977.

Schultz, J. L. Integration of emotionally disturbed students: The role of the director of special education. Exceptional Children, September, 1973, 39-41.

Shapiro, L. F. Early childhood special education: A delicate balance. E R I C Document Reproduction No. 127-185-EC-0-90-388, 1976.

Siegel, E. Special education in the regular classroom. Binghampton, N. Y., The John Day Company, 1969.

What is a handicap? Santa Monica, Ca.: BFA Educational Media (A division of CBS), 1977. Audio-visual package.

APPENDIX A

PILOT STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: Please circle the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following questions.

1. All handicapped children should receive their education in the regular classrooms of the public schools along with the rest of the children.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2. Only those handicapped children who can take care of their own feeding, cleaning and toilet needs should be educated in the public schools.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
3. Regardless of their level of ability, handicapped children should not receive their education in regular public school classrooms with other non-handicapped children.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4. If handicapped children do not receive their education in special facilities apart from the regular classrooms of the public school system, the quality of the education they receive will suffer greatly.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5. Only handicapped children with normal intelligence should be allowed to receive their education in the regular classrooms of the public schools.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6. ALL OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE PREFACED WITH THIS PHRASE: If handicapped and nonhandicapped children were taught together in the regular classrooms of the public schools. . . .						
a. the quality of education received by the handicapped children would suffer.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
b. the quality of the education received by the nonhandicapped children would suffer.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
c. the handicapped child would receive more attention and help than the nonhandicapped child.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

d. the handicapped child would have a bad influence on the nonhandicapped children.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
e. the nonhandicapped child would not progress as quickly because the class would have to be "held back" for the handicapped child.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
f. the handicapped child would disrupt class with inappropriate behaviors.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
g. the handicapped child might influence the nonhandicapped child to act in a younger, less mature way.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
h. the nonhandicapped child might be permanently negatively affected by his/her contact with the handicapped child in the classroom.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
i. the nonhandicapped child would learn to help those who need additional assistance to achieve.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
j. the handicapped child would be the object of constant ridicule and abuse by the nonhandicapped children.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
k. the handicapped child would be rejected by the nonhandicapped child during play and social activities.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
l. the nonhandicapped child would learn bad habits from the handicapped children.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
m. the teacher would spend more time with the handicapped children in the classroom.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
n. much of the time, the nonhandicapped children would be left "on their own" without the direct personal guidance of the teacher.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
o. the class presentations would be at a "lower level" than usual to accommodate the special children in the class.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
p. the nonhandicapped child would be exposed to a lot of disgusting and revolting experiences.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

q. more than one teacher would be required so the needs of all the children could be met.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
r. too much time would be taken up tending to the personal needs (hygiene, toilet, etc.) of the handicapped children.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
s. the children couldn't go on many special field trips because of the difficulty of transporting the handicapped children.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
t. the "normal" children would be considered "less intelligent" and less capable of achieving than their peers who do not share a classroom with handicapped children.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
u. normal children might become retarded or different because of their contact with the handicapped children.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
v. all the children would become more tolerant and accepting of each other.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
w. the school would get a "bad reputation" for the quality of their education.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
x. the teacher would lose his/her temper more easily and generally become more irritable and cross than the teacher who didn't have handicapped children in his/her classroom.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
7. Only those children who have special problems but who look normal should be allowed to receive education with the other children in public schools.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
8. Special education teachers who teach children with handicaps just don't have as good a training or as many skills as regular public school teachers.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
9. Only those teachers who have received special training on how to teach children with handicaps are qualified to do so.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
10. Handicapped children should receive their education with others like themselves.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

11.	Normal children should not be forced to be educated with handicapped children.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
12.	Normal and handicapped children do not have much in common.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
13.	Exposure to a handicapped child is very traumatic and can be harmful to a nonhandicapped child.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
14.	If children learn about the differences between people when they are young, they will be more tolerant and compassionate toward these children when they are older.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
15.	Teaching handicapped children in special, separate facilities implies that these children are not worthy of contact with normal children.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
16.	Handicapped children have very few abilities.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
17.	It's really not worth it to educate handicapped children because there's nothing they can do when they grow up anyway.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
18.	Handicapped children should be taught in special, separate classrooms and schools where they can learn skills suitable to handicapped individuals.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
19.	It's good to label handicapped children as mentally retarded or blind or deaf because then you know what their problems are.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
20.	Children should receive equal education regardless of their particular abilities or physical limitations.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
21.	Overall, what kind of an effect do you think a child with special needs will have on the non-handicapped child in the classroom?	Extremely Positive	Moderately Positive	Somewhat Positive	Somewhat Negative	Moderately Negative	Extremely Negative
22.	Overall, what kind of an effect do you think non-handicapped children will have on the handicapped child in the classroom?	Extremely Positive	Moderately Positive	Somewhat Positive	Somewhat Negative	Moderately Negative	Extremely Negative

23. Suppose you have a child with a handicap. How would you react if your handicapped child were placed in a regular classroom in a public school? Check one.

____ I would remove my child from the class.
____ I would strongly object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would feel uncomfortable about my child being in such a class.
____ I wouldn't object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would be pleased if my child were in such a class.
____ I would transfer my child into such a class.

24. How do you think you would feel if your nonhandicapped child were placed in a classroom in a public school that also had handicapped children in it? Check one.

____ I would remove my child from the class.
____ I would strongly object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would feel uncomfortable about my child being in such a class.
____ I wouldn't object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would be pleased if my child were placed in such a class.
____ I would transfer my child into such a class.

50

25. Please rate the usefulness of each of these possible resources in helping to teach handicapped children in the classroom.

Please put an "X" at any point on the line that best represents your opinion.

a. Availability of a regular newsletter with information about the educational needs of special children.
   a. Very useful _____ Not useful at all

b. Availability of extra library materials.
   b. Very useful _____ Not useful at all

c. An aide or assistant teacher who works with you in the classroom on a regular basis.
   c. Very useful _____ Not useful at all

d. A resource specialist you can call for advice and consultation.
   d. Very useful _____ Not useful at all

e. Access to a computer connected typewriter at your school that will answer your questions about what you should be doing with the special child.
   e. Very useful _____ Not useful at all

f. A bibliography of special resource materials available at the library.
   f. Very useful _____ Not useful at all

26. Five types of educational arrangements are listed in the column on the right. Please write the letter of the educational arrangement you feel will best serve the needs of each group of children, listed on the appropriate line, on the left. You may use each response letter more than once.

____ children with mild learning disabilities
____ severely mentally retarded children
____ children with physical handicaps
____ autistic children
____ emotionally disturbed children
____ trainable mentally retarded children
____ children with hearing impairments
____ children with speech problems
____ children with visual handicaps

A. a separate, special school
B. a special school that shares a site with a regular school
C. a special classroom in a regular school
D. a classroom with both handicapped and non-handicapped children where the handicapped children receive some special assistance
E. a classroom where handicapped and nonhandicapped receive the same educational material

27.	The handicapped child can function socially in the regular classroom.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
28.	The teacher's attention will be more equally divided among the children if the class as a whole participates in activities rather than dividing the class into small independent groups.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
29.	The teacher cannot assess the level of each child's skills (i.e., social, motor, etc.) if s/he stresses involvement in individual, small group activities.	Strongly Agress	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
30.	Giving a young child too much freedom of choice in the classroom will make him/her more difficult to handle in the later grades.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
31.	The school environment must be well planned and structured if maximum learning is to occur.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
32.	The teacher must be the focus of the child's attention in the classroom.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
33.	Discipline and order must be maintained in the classroom.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
34.	Playtime activities without real academic content take up too much time in the current classroom curricula.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
35.	A child who is socially shy or physically "different" will make little progress in an unstructured classroom situation.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

36. Thinking and learning will be enhanced by exposure to a wide variety of materials, equipment, and activities.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
37. Parents should be directly involved in their child's education at school through parent volunteer programs.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
38. It is best to include children of different age groups in the same classroom.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
39. Observable activity rather than thought is more important in the curriculum of younger children.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
40. Young children do not have the capacity to "discover" things for themselves -- they need the teacher to show them "how" or "why."	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

41. How important are these values as classroom goals for the child?

Please put an "X" at any point on the line that best represents your opinion.

a. Cooperation	a. Very important	Not important
b. Courtesy	b. Very important	Not important
c. Promptness	c. Very important	Not important
d. Orderliness	d. Very important	Not important
e. Individuality	e. Very important	Not important
f. Creativeness	f. Very important	Not important
g. A sense of wrong and right	g. Very important	Not important
h. Independence	h. Very important	Not important
i. Self-control	i. Very important	Not important
j. Ability to work toward a goal	j. Very important	Not important
k. Developing a sense of responsibility	k. Very important	Not important
l. Curiosity	l. Very important	Not important
m. Achievement motivation	m. Very important	Not important
n. Ability to relate appropriately to adults	n. Very important	Not important
o. Ability to interact with peers	o. Very important	Not important

42. The teacher should not stand back and wait for development to take place in the child. Development is not automatic.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
43. The experiences that the young child has with his/her first classroom will profoundly affect his/her growth and attitude toward later schooling.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

44. The organization of the curriculum may be as important as the individual experiences themselves.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
45. One-to-one child/teacher interactions are more effective than teacher/group interactions.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
46. Making cognitive-intellectual gains are more important than establishing social competencies.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
47. Free, expressive play is more important than the formal teaching of skills.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
48. Only a specifically trained therapist is qualified to administer physical, occupational or speech therapy to a child.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
49. Only a specifically trained therapist can assess the progress a child is making in their particular area of difficulty.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
50. Only verbal praise should be used as reinforcement in the classroom.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
51. If a child is reinforced by hugs, handshakes or other affectionate gestures, s/he will confuse the teacher and the parent.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
52. The most effective way for children to learn is by planning their behavior and sequencing the proper responses.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
53. Parents can aid the educational development of their children at home.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
54. Children benefit more if they are self-taught because they are not "held back."	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
55. The teacher's efforts should concentrate on developing a stimulating room environment.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
56. In the long run, how a teacher teaches is more important than what s/he teaches.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
57. The classroom environment should stimulate group rather than individual play.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

58. Teacher defined classroom objectives. . . .

a. are too precise	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
b. are too limiting	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
c. are too general	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
d. can't be easily evaluated	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
e. results can't be applied in other situations	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
59. The children themselves can learn by discovering with little intervention from the teacher.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

74

60. In order for maximum learning to occur, how much of the child's class time should be filled with activities planned by the teacher?

100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 20% 10% 0%
/ / / / / / / / / / /

61. In order for maximum learning to occur, how much of the child's class time should be planned by the child him/herself?

100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 20% 10% 0%
/ / / / / / / / / / /

62. To what extent do the following characteristics define the teacher's role in the classroom?

Please put an "X" at any point on the line that best represents your opinion.

a. Substitute parent	a. Very much	Not at all
b. Supervisor	b. Very much	Not at all
c. Helper-facilitator	c. Very much	Not at all
d. Consultant	d. Very much	Not at all
e. Passive observer	e. Very much	Not at all
f. Center of attention	f. Very much	Not at all

63. If a child is given too much of a structured, planned classroom environment when s/he is young, s/he will be less able to plan activities him/herself in the future.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
64. Invention and discovery cannot be utilized with young children.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

75

65. Children should be passive receptors of information.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
66. The goal for each child should be self-propelled, individualized learning.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
67. If the teacher takes a passive, supervisorial role in the classroom, the children will become introverted and socially shy.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
68. A good teacher doesn't require many materials to be used in demonstration.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
69. Paper and pencil exercises should be avoided.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
70. Homework or take-home projects are inappropriate.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
71. Teaching involves more than having a set of skills.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
72. Anyone can be a teacher.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
73. Before a child can understand or apply a concept, s/he must know the mechanics involved.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
74. Too much emphasis on achievement and success gives the child no latitude for exploration.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
75. Teaching machines have no place in our educational system.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
76. If children do not participate in all the planned activities, the quality of education received will differ.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
77. The same educational methods that work in the regular classroom will work with children with handicaps.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
78. The handicapped child can function academically in the regular classroom.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

APPENDIX B

PILOT STUDY INFORMATION SHEET

children's services center

A Division of Casa Colina Hospital of Rehabilitative Medicine

Hospital Accreditation:

Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals

Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitative Facilities

REHABILITATIVE SERVICES AND PROGRAMS FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES

Therapeutic Preschool

Diagnostic Evaluation

Pediatric Consultation

Family Guidance

Family Therapy

Outreach: Consultation to Schools

Parent Education

Infant Development

School Age Group Therapy

Professional Training

Community Referral

DATE: 10/25/76

TO: Staff, Parents and Friends

FROM: Elizabeth M. Neumann, Ph.D., Director,
Children's Services Center
Christine Harris, M.A., Research Associate,
Children's Services Center

We have some State Department of Education Research funds. We need a few people to complete a questionnaire. We are able to pay $10.00 for each person who is selected to fill out one.

Please check the statement that best represents your point of view.

____ On the whole, I do not feel that "Mainstreaming" (integrating) handicapped children into regular classrooms is a good idea.

____ On the whole, I feel that "Mainstreaming" (integrating) handicapped children into regular classrooms is a good idea.

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

Daytime Phone: _____

PLEASE RETURN IMMEDIATELY, IF INTERESTED, TO:

Jean Moore, Administrative Assistant, Children's Services Center

255 East Bonita Avenue, Pomona, California 91767 • Tel. (714) 593-7521

APPENDIX C

RESULTS OF THE PILOT STUDY

RESULTS OF PILOT STUDY

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM	STATISTICAL ANALYSIS* I	S	SxI	DECISION
1. All handicapped children should receive their education in the regular classrooms of the schools along with the rest of the children.	$p \leq .10$	$p \leq .10$	$p \leq .9$	Discard* (Duplicates another question)
2. Only those handicapped children who can take care of their own feeling, cleaning and toilet needs should be educated in the public schools.	$p \leq .25$	$p \leq .17$	$p \leq .9$	Discard
3. Regardless of their level of ability, handicapped children should not receive their education in regular public school classrooms with other nonhandicapped children.	$p \leq .9$	$p \leq .03$	$p \leq .9$	Retain
4. If handicapped children do not receive their education in special facilities apart from the regular classrooms of the public school system, the quality of the education they receive will suffer greatly.	$p \leq .1$	$p \leq .05$	$p \leq .9$	Retain
5. Only handicapped children with normal intelligence should be allowed to receive their education in the regular classrooms of the public schools.	$p \leq .05$	$p \leq .9$	$p \leq .24$	Retain
6. ALL OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE PREFACED WITH THIS PHRASE: If handicapped and nonhandicapped children were taught together in the regular classrooms of the public schools. . . .				
a. the quality of education received by the handicapped children would suffer.	$p \leq .1$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain

* I = Main effect of INITIAL ATTITUDE
S = Main effect of SEX OF RESPONDENT
SxI = INTERACTION of above two factors

[1] Retained because pilot population may not have been knowledgeable about such specific topics in education.

	I	S	SxI	
b. the quality of the education received by the nonhandicapped children would suffer.	$p \leq .01$	$p \leq .9$	$p \leq .9$	Retain
c. the handicapped child would receive more attention and help than the nonhandicapped child.	$p \leq .9$	$p \leq .27$	$p \leq .9$	Discard
d. the handicapped child would have a bad influence on the nonhandicapped children.	$p \leq .17$	$p \leq .07$	$p \leq .9$	Retain
e. the nonhandicapped child would not progress as quickly because the class would have to be "held back" for the handicapped child.	$p \leq .02$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .25$	Retain
f. the handicapped child would disrupt class with inappropriate behaviors.	$p \leq .007$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
g. the handicapped child might influence the nonhandicapped child to act in a younger, less mature way.	$p \leq .9$	$p \leq .09$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
h. the nonhandicapped child might be permanently negatively affected by his/her contact with the handicapped child in the classroom.	$p \leq .04$	$p \leq .9$	$p \leq .18$	Retain
i. the nonhandicapped child would learn to help those who need additional assistance to achieve.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .26$	Discard
j. the handicapped child would be the object of constant ridicule and abuse by the non-handicapped children.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .24$	$p \leq .99$	Discard
k. the handicapped child would be rejected by the nonhandicapped child during play and social activities.	$p \leq .28$	$p \leq .12$	$p \leq .99$	Discard
l. the nonhandicapped child would learn bad habits from the handicapped children.	$p \leq .01$	$p \leq .04$	$p \leq .16$	Retained (but omitted from questionnaire)
m. the teacher would spend more time with the handicapped children in the classroom.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .20$	$p \leq .99$	Discard

		I	S	SxI	
n.	much of the time, the nonhandicapped children would be left "on their own" without the direct personal guidance of the teacher.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Discard
o.	the class presentations would be at a "lower level" than usual to accommodate the special children in the class.	$p \leq .05$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
p.	the nonhandicapped child would be exposed to a lot of disgusting and revolting experiences.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .05$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
q.	more than one teacher would be required so the needs of all the children could be met.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .07$	$p \leq .34$	Retain
r.	too much time would be taken up tending to the personal needs (hygiene, toilet, etc.) of the handicapped children.	$p \leq .14$	$p \leq .24$	$p \leq .99$	Discard
s.	the children couldn't go on many special field trips because of the difficulty of transporting the handicapped children.	$p \leq .23$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Discard
t.	the "normal" children would be considered "less intelligent" and less capable of achieving than their peers who do not share a classroom with handicapped children.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .09$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
u.	normal children might become retarded or different because of their contact with the handicapped children.	$p \leq .13$	$p \leq .13$	$p \leq .9$	Retain
v.	all the children would become more tolerant and accepting of each other.	$p \leq .27$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .27$	Discard
w.	the school would get a "bad reputation" for the quality of their education.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .006$	$p \leq .31$	Retain
x.	the teacher would lose his/her temper more easily and generally become more irritable and cross than the teacher who didn't have handicapped children in his/her classroom.	$p \leq .17$	$p \leq .22$	$p \leq .99$	Retain

		I	S	SxI	
7.	Only those children who have special problems but who look normal should be allowed to receive education with the other children in public schools.	$p \leq .12$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
8.	Special education teachers who teach children with handicaps just don't have as good a training or as many skills as regular public school teachers.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .05$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
9.	Only those teachers who have received special training on how to teach children with handicaps are qualified to do so.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .21$	Retain[1]
10.	Handicapped children should receive their education with others like themselves.	$p \leq .06$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
11.	Normal children should not be forced to be educated with handicapped children.	$p \leq .006$	$p \leq .21$	$p \leq .11$	Retain
12.	Normal and handicapped children do not have much in common.	$p \leq .11$	$p \leq .25$	$p \leq .25$	Retain
13.	Exposure to a handicapped child is very traumatic and can be harmful to a nonhandicapped child.	$p \leq .04$	$p \leq .003$	$p \leq .09$	Retain
14.	If children learn about the differences between people when they are young, they will be more tolerant and compassionate toward these children when they are older.	$p \leq .05$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
15.	Teaching handicapped children in special, separate facilities implies that these children are not worthy of contact with normal children.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Discard
16.	Handicapped children have very few abilities.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .04$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
17.	It's really not worth it to educate handicapped children because there's nothing they can do when they grow up anyway.	$p \leq .19$	$p \leq .02$	$p \leq .16$	Retain
18.	Handicapped children should be taught in special, separate classrooms and schools where they can learn skills suitable to handicapped individuals.	$p \leq .002$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain

		I	S	SxI	
19.	It's good to label handicapped children as mentally retarded or blind or deaf because then you know what their problems are.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Discard
20.	Children should receive equal education regardless of their particular abilities or physical limitations.	$p \leq .15$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Discard
21.	Overall, what kind of an effect do you think a child with special needs will have on the nonhandicapped child in the classroom?	$p \leq .06$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
22.	Overall, what kind of an effect do you think non-handicapped children will have on the handicapped child in the classroom?	$p \leq .16$	$p \leq .32$	$p \leq .99$	Retain (Important because of relationship to question 21)
23.	Suppose you have a child with a handicap? How would you react if your handicapped child were placed in a regular classroom in a public school? Check one.	$p \leq .15$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .06$	Retain

____ I would remove my child from the class.
____ I would strongly object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would feel uncomfortable about my child being in such a class.
____ I wouldn't object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would be pleased if my child were placed in such a class.
____ I would transfer my child into such a class.

24.	How do you think you would feel if your nonhandicapped child were placed in a classroom in a public school that also had handicapped children in it? Check one.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .25$	$p \leq .99$	Retain (Important because of relationship to question 23)

____ I would remove my child from the class.
____ I would strongly object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would feel uncomfortable about my child being in such a class.
____ I wouldn't object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would be pleased if my child were placed in such a class.
____ I would transfer my child into such a class.

	I	S	SxI	
25. Please rate the usefulness of each of these possible resources in helping to teach handicapped children in the regular classroom.				
a. Availability of a regular newsletter with information about the educational needs of special children.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
b. Availability of extra library materials.	$p \leq .27$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
c. An aide or assistant teacher who works with you in the classroom on a regular basis.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .12$	$p \leq .26$	Retain[1]
d. A resource specialist you can call for advice and consultation.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .29$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
e. Access to a computer connected typewriter at your school that will answer your questions about what you should be doing with the special child.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .01$	Retain
f. A bibliography of special resource materials available at the library.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]

26. Five types of educational arrangements are listed in the column on the right. Please write the letter of the appropriate educational arrangement you feel will best serve the needs of each group of children, listed on the appropriate line, on the left. You may use each response letter more than once.

____ children with mild learning disabilities	$p \leq .021$	$p \leq .22$	$p \leq .22$	Retain[1]
____ severely mentally retarded children	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
____ children with physical handicaps	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
____ autistic children	$p \leq .22$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
____ emotionally disturbed children	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .29$	$p \leq .29$	Retain[1]
____ trainable mentally retarded children	$p \leq .23$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
____ children with hearing impairments	$p \leq .04$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
____ children with speech problems	$p \leq .04$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
____ children with visual handicaps	$p \leq .12$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]

A. a separate, special school
B. a special school that shares a site with a regular school
C. a special classroom in a regular school
D. a classroom with both handicapped and nonhandicapped children where the handicapped children receive some special assistance
E. a classroom where handicapped and nonhandicapped receive the same educational material

		I	S	SxI	
27.	The handicapped child can function socially in the regular classroom.	$p \leq .24$	$p \leq .03$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
28.	The teacher's attention will be more equally divided among the children if the class as a whole participates in activities rather than dividing the class into small groups.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .001$	$p \leq .17$	Retain
29.	The teacher cannot assess the level of each child's skills (i.e., social, motor, etc.) if s/he stresses involvement in individual, small group activities.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .004$	$p \leq .04$	Retain
30.	Giving a young child too much freedom of choice in the classroom will make him/her more difficult to handle in the later grades.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .16$	$p \leq .99$	Discard
31.	The school environment must be well planned and structured if maximum learning is to occur.	$p \leq .25$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Discard
32.	The teacher must be the focus of the child's attention in the classroom.	$p \leq .02$	$p \leq .02$	$p \leq .05$	Retain
33.	Discipline and order must be maintained in the classroom.	$p \leq .15$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .14$	Retain[1]
34.	Playtime activities without real academic content take up too much time in the current classroom curricula.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .07$	Retain
35.	A child who is socially shy or physically "different" will make little progress in an unstructured classroom situation.	$p \leq .14$	$p \leq .14$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
36.	Thinking and learning will be enhanced by exposure to a wide variety of materials, equipment and activities.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .002$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
37.	Parents should be directly involved in their child's education at school through parent volunteer programs.	$p \leq .01$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .16$	Retain
38.	It is best to include children of different age groups in the same classroom.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .07$	Discard

	I	S	SxI	
39. Observable activity rather than thought is more important in the curriculum of younger children	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Discard
40. Young children do not have the capacity to "discover" things for themselves -- they need the teacher to show them "how" or "why."	$p \leq .22$	$p \leq .08$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
41. How important are these values as classroom goals for the child?				
a. Cooperation	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
b. Courtesy	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
c. Promptness	$p \leq .24$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
d. Orderliness	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
e. Individuality	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
f. Creativeness	$p \leq .09$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
g. A sense of wrong and right	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
h. Independence	$p \leq .03$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
i. Self-control	$p \leq .11$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
j. Ability to engage in purposeful activities	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .28$	Retain[1]
k. Developing a sense of responsibility	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .32$	$p \leq .18$	Retain[1]
l. Curiosity	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .11$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
m. Achievement motivation	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .31$	$p \leq .19$	Retain[1]
n. Ability to relate appropriately to adults	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .14$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
o. Ability to interact with peers	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]

		I	S	SxI	
42.	The teacher should not stand back and wait for development to take place in the child. Development is not automatic.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Discard
43.	The experiences that the young child has with his/her first classroom will profoundly affect his/her growth and attitude toward later schooling.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .16$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
44.	The organization of the curriculum may be as important as the individual experiences themselves.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Discard
45.	One-to-one child/teacher interactions are more effective than teacher/group interactions.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .14$	Retain[1]
46.	Making cognitive/intellectual gains are more important than establishing social competencies.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
47.	Free, expressive play is more important than the formal teaching of skills.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .08$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
48.	Only a specifically trained therapist is qualified to administer physical, occupational or speech therapy to a child.	$p \leq .14$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
49.	Only a specifically trained therapist can assess the progress a child is making in their particular area of difficulty.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
50.	Only verbal praise should be used as reinforcement in the classroom.	$p \leq .22$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .22$	Discard
51.	If a child is reinforced by hugs, handshakes or other affectionate gestures, s/he will confuse the teacher and the parent.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Discard
52.	The most effective way for children to learn is by planning their behavior and sequencing the proper responses.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .18$	$p \leq .08$	Discard

		I	S	SxI	
53.	Parents can aid the educational development of their children at home.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Discard
54.	Children benefit more if they are self-taught because they are not "held back."	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Discard
55.	The teacher should concentrate on developing a stimulating room environment.	$p \leq .2$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .2$	Retain[1]
56.	In the long run, how a teacher teaches is more important than what s/he teaches.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .23$	$p \leq .99$	Discard
57.	The classroom environment should stimulate group rather than individual play.	$p \leq .33$	$p \leq .08$	$p \leq .30$	Retain
58.	Teacher defined classroom objectives. . . .				
	a. are too precise	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .005$	$p \leq .01$	Retain
	b. are too limiting	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .24$	$p \leq .12$	Discard
	c. are too general	$p \leq .29$	$p \leq .14$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
	d. can't be easily evaluated	$p \leq .004$	$p \leq .001$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
	e. results can't be applied in other situations	$p \leq .04$	$p \leq .14$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
59.	The children themselves can learn by discovering with little intervention from the teacher.	$p \leq .05$	$p \leq .14$	$p \leq .11$	Retain
60.	In order for maximum learning to occur, how much of the child's class time should be filled with activities planned by the teacher?	$p \leq .11$	$p \leq .30$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
61.	In order for maximum learning to occur, how much of the child's class time should be planned by the child him/herself?	$p \leq .05$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .32$	Retain

	I	S	SxI	
62. To what extent do the following characteristics define the teacher's role in the classroom?				
a. Substitute parent	$p \leq .28$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .20$	Retain
b. Supervisor	$p \leq .17$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
c. Helper-facilitator	$p \leq .24$	$p \leq .07$	$p \leq .24$	Retain
d. Consultant	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .15$	$p \leq .08$	Retain
e. Passive observer	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .32$	Retain[1]
f. Center of attention	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain[1]
63. If a child is given too much of a structured, planned classroom environment when s/he is young, s/he will be less able to plan activities him/herself in the future.	$p \leq .17$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .06$	Discard* (Duplicates a previous question)
64. Invention and discovery cannot be utilized with young children.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .003$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
65. Children should be passive receptors of information.	$p \leq .08$	$p \leq .004$	$p \leq .08$	Retain
66. The goal for each child should be self-propelled individualized learning.	$p \leq .17$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
67. If the teacher takes a passive supervisorial role in the classroom, the children will become introverted and socially shy.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .06$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
68. A good teacher doesn't require many materials to be used in demonstration.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .11$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
69. Pencil and paper exercises should be avoided.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Discard
70. Homework or take home projects are inappropriate.	$p \leq .14$	$p \leq .02$	$p \leq .33$	Retain

67

		I	S	SxI	
71.	Teaching involves more than having a set of skills.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .27$	Discard
72.	Anyone can be a teacher.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .29$	$p \leq .17$	Discard
73.	Before a child can understand or apply a concept, s/he must know the mechanics involved.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .29$	$p \leq .17$	Discard
74.	Too much emphasis on achievement and success gives the child no latitude for exploration.	$p \leq .14$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .25$	Discard
75.	Teaching machines have no place in our educational system.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .006$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
76.	If children do not participate in all the planned activities, the quality of the education received will differ.	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .006$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
77.	The same educational methods that work in the regular classroom will work with children with handicaps.	$p \leq .03$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain
78.	The handicapped child can function academically in the regular classroom.	$p \leq .07$	$p \leq .99$	$p \leq .99$	Retain

APPENDIX D

PILOT SUBJECT RESPONSE SHEET

CHILDREN'S SERVICES CENTER

A Division of Casa Colina Hospital of Rehabilitative Medicine

Hospital Accreditation:

Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals

Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitative Facilities

REHABILITATIVE SERVICES AND PROGRAMS FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES

Therapeutic Preschool

Diagnostic Evaluation

Pediatric Consultation

Family Guidance

Family Therapy

Outreach: Consultation to Schools

Parent Education

Infant Development

School Age Group Therapy

Professional Training

Community Referral

Thank you for helping us develop this research questionnaire.

Please circle any items that are unclear. Complete each item on the questionnaire and then fill in the questions below.

1. Time it took to complete: _____ minutes.

2. What changes would you make? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. General comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you again for your help.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth M. Neumann

Christine Harris

Elizabeth M. Neumann, Ph.D.
Director
Children's Services Center

Christine Harris, M.A.
Research Associate
Children's Services Center

255 East Bonita Avenue, Pomona, California 91767 • Tel. (714) 593-7521

APPENDIX E

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

children's services center

A Division of Casa Colina Hospital of Rehabilitative Medicine

Hospital Accreditation:

Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals

Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitative Facilities

REHABILITATIVE SERVICES AND PROGRAMS FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES

Therapeutic Preschool

Diagnostic Evaluation

Pediatric Consultation

Family Guidance

Family Therapy

Outreach: Consultation to Schools

Parent Education

Infant Development

School Age Group Therapy

Professional Training

Community Referral

Dear Survey Participant:

We are committed to ethical practices in research. For this reason, we want persons who participate in this study to be fully informed of the purpose of the study and the intended use of the final results.

Thank you for your help. Your questions and comments are encouraged.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth M. Neumann

Elizabeth M. Neumann, Ph.D.
Project Director

Christine Harris

Christine Harris, M.A.
Research Associate

PARTCIPANT AGREEMENT

I have read the Page 1 information about the questionnaire study on attitudes towards mainstreaming in education and agree to participate. I understand that:

a. my responses to the questions will be kept strictly confidential.

b. my name will not be associated with the study or with any of the responses.

c. the research findings will be summarized in a paper and disseminated by the Department of Education of the State of California.

d. I am free to withdraw my participation at any time, should I decide to do so, at no penalty.

e. I will receive a $10 honorarium for completing the questionnaire.

_____ _____

Signature of Person Agreeing to Participate Date

_____

Participant's Address: Number, Street, City, Zip Code

255 East Bonita Avenue, Pomona, California 91767 • Tel. (714) 593-7521

APPENDIX F

QUESTIONNAIRE COVER SHEET

Elizabeth M. Neumann, Ph.D.
Director, Children's Services Center

Christine Harris, M.A.
Research Associate

Casa Colina Hospital
255 East Bonita Avenue
Pomona, California 91767

Phone: 714/593-7521 Ext. 275

SCHOOL OPINION SURVEY

We have a grant from the State of California to collect information about the opinions of teachers, parents and administrators in early childhood education. Your answers will help increase the quality of education received by all children in this State. Please be assured that anything you say will be held in strict confidence. At no time will your name be associated with any particular responses or with this study.

One of the purposes of this opinion survey is to discover how you feel about "mainstreaming 3 to 5 year olds." By mainstreaming, we mean teaching 3 to 5 year old handicapped and non-handicapped children together in the same classroom.

A HANDICAPPED CHILD IS DEFINED AS ANY OF THE FOLLOWING

1. Physically handicapped child: A 3 to 5 year old child with normal mental ability, who may need a walker, crutch, brace or wheelchair for mobility; who may have an artificial or missing limb and/or who may have some spasticity or muscle uncoordination.
2. Language delayed child: A 3 to 5 year old child with normal mental ability on non-language tests. This child can do puzzles and other non-language tasks like a child his/her own age, but s/he uses words like a child who is about 2 years younger than him/herself.
3. A trainable mentally retarded child: A moderately mentally retarded child who is 3 to 5 years old. This child's mental and social skills, both those that require language and those that do not, are about 2 years below his/her age level.

Please answer all the questions. We are interested in how you <u>really</u> feel on these issues, so please be as honest and frank as you can.

IN ANSWERING THESE QUESTIONS, KEEP THE FOLLOWING POINTS IN MIND

1. Consider children, both handicapped and non-handicapped, who are from 3 to 5 years old (preschool and kindergarten age).
2. Handicapped and/or disabled children are those described on the preceding page; who are:
   (a) physically handicapped
   (b) language delayed
   (c) mentally retarded
3. The main issue is whether these 3 to 5 year old children should be taught in the same classrooms as non-handicapped children of the same age.

APPENDIX G

GENERAL INFORMATION SHEET

Parents

Teachers and Administrators

GENERAL INFORMATION

A. PARENTS

1. Sex: ____Male

   ____Female

2. Age: _____

3. a. Number of children in your family: _____

   b. Do you have any handicapped children in your famil,? ____Yes ____No

   c. Do you have a handicap yourself? ____Yes ____No

4. Occupation: (Check ali that apply)

   ____ Parent

   ____ Regular classroom teacher

   ____ Special education teacher

   ____ School administrator

   ____ Resource specialist

5. Education

   Please circle highest grade completed. . . .

   Elementary: 5 6 7 8

   High School: 1 2 3 4

   College: 1 2 3 4

6. Have you ever worked with or been acquainted with persons having any of the following handicaps? (Check all that apply)

   ____ Emotionally disturbed

   ____ Mentally retarded

   ____ Learning disabled

   ____ Physically handicapped

   ____ Visually impaired

   ____ Speech impaired

   ____ Hearing impaired

   ____ Autistic

GENERAL INFORMATION

B. Teachers and Administrators

1. Sex: ____ Male
   ____ Female

2. Age: _____

3. a. Number of children in your family: _____

   b. Do you have any handicapped children in your family? ____Yes ____No

   c. Do you have a handicap yourself? ____Yes ____No

4. Occupation (Check all that apply)

   ____ Parent
   ____ Regular classroom teacher
   ____ Special education teacher
   ____ School administrator
   ____ Resource specialist

5. Education

   (Please circle the highest grade completed)

   Elementary: 5 6 7 8
   High School: 1 2 3 4
   College: 1 2 3 4

   a. Have a B.A. degree? ____Yes ____No
      Year granted_____
      Field_____

   b. Have an M.A. degree? ____Yes ____No
      Year granted_____
      Field_____

   c. Have a Ph.D., Ed.D., Th.D. or M.D. degree? ____Yes ____No
      Year granted_____
      Field_____

6. Have you ever worked with or been acquainted with persons having any of the following handicaps?

   ____ Emotionally disturbed
   ____ Mentally retarded
   ____ Learning disabled
   ____ Physically handicapped
   ____ Visually impaired
   ____ Speech impaired
   ____ Hearing impaired
   ____ Autistic

7. How many years teaching experience do you have? _____

8. How many years at your present type of teaching? _____

9. If you work with handicapped children, what is your specialty? _____

10. Do you work in a: ____public school or ____private school?

APPENDIX H

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: Please circle the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following questions. Please circle only one response per question.

1. Regardless of their level of ability, handicapped children should not receive their education in regular public school classrooms with other nonhandicapped children.

Physically handicapped child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Language delayed child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A trainable mentally retarded child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

2. If handicapped children do not receive their education in special facilities apart from the regular classrooms of the public school system, the quality of education they receive will suffer greatly.

A trainable mentally retarded child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Physically handicapped child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Language delayed child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

75

3. Only handicapped children with normal intelligence should be educated in the regular classrooms of the public schools.

	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. ALL OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE PREFACED WITH THIS PHRASE:

If handicapped and nonhandicapped children were taught together in the regular classrooms of the public schools. . . .

a. the quality of education received by the handicapped children would suffer.

A trainable mentally retarded child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Language delayed child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Physically handicapped child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

116

117

b. the quality of the education received by the nonhandicapped children would suffer.

Language delayed child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Physically handicapped child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A trainable mentally retarded child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

c. the handicapped child would have a bad influence on the nonhandicapped children.

Physically handicapped child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A trainable mentally retarded child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Language delayed child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

d. the nonhandicapped child would not progress as quickly because the class would have to be "held back" for the handicapped child.

Language delayed child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A trainable mentally retarded child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Physically handicapped child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

e. the handicapped child would disrupt class with inappropriate behaviors.

Language delayed child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Physically handicapped child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A trainable mentally retarded child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

f. the handicapped child might influence the nonhandicapped child to act in a younger, less mature way.

Language delayed child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A trainable mentally retarded child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Physically handicapped child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

g. the nonhandicapped child might have a permanent, negative effect on the handicapped child in the classroom.

Physically handicapped child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A trainable mentally retarded child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Language delayed child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

77

h. the class presentations would be at a "lower level" than usual to accommodate the special children in the class.

A trainable mentally retarded child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Physically handicapped child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Language delayed child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

i. the nonhandicapped child would be exposed to a lot of disgusting and revolting experiences.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
j. more than one teacher would be required so the needs of all the children could be met.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

k. the "normal" children would be considered "less intelligent" and less capable of achieving than their peers who do not share a classroom with handicapped children.

A trainable mentally retarded child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Physically handicapped child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Language delayed child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

l. normal children might become retarded or different because of their contact with the handicapped children.

Physically handicapped child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A trainable mentally retarded child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Language delayed child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

78

m. the school would get a "bad reputation" for the quality of their education.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
n. the teacher would be more irritable and cross than the teacher who didn't have handicapped children in his/her classroom.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5. Only those children who have special problems but who look normal should be allowed to receive education with the other children in public schools.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
6. Special education teachers who teach children with handicaps don't have as good a training or as many skills as regular public school teachers.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
7. Only teachers who have received special training on how to teach children with handicaps are qualified to do so.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

8. Handicapped children should receive their education with others like themselves.

Physically handicapped child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Language delayed child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A trainable mentally retarded child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

9. Normal children should not be forced to be educated with handicapped children.

A trainable mentally retarded child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Language delayed child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Physically handicapped child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

79

10. Normal and handicapped children do not have much in common.

A trainable mentally retarded child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Physically handicapped child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Language delayed child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

11. Exposure to a handicapped child is very traumatic and can be harmful to a nonhandicapped child.

Physically handicapped child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A trainable mentally retarded child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Language delayed child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

12a

12. If children learn about the differences between people when they are young, they will be more tolerant and compassionate toward these children when they are older.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
13. Handicapped children have very few abilities.						
Physically handicapped child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Language delayed child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A trainable mentally retarded child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
14. It's really not worth it to educate handicapped children because there's nothing they can do when they grow up.						
Language delayed child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Physically handicapped child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A trainable mentally retarded child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
15. Handicapped children should be taught in special, separate classrooms and schools where they can learn skills suitable to handicapped individuals.						
A trainable mentally retarded child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Language delayed child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Physically handicapped child	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

16. Overall, what kind of an effect do you think a child with special needs will have on the nonhandicapped child in the classroom?

Language delayed child	Extremely Positive	Moderately Positive	Somewhat Positive	Somewhat Negative	Moderately Negative	Extremely Negative
A trainable mentally retarded child	Extremely Positive	Moderately Positive	Somewhat Positive	Somewhat Negative	Moderately Negative	Extremely Negative
Physically handicapped child	Extremely Positive	Moderately Positive	Somewhat Positive	Somewhat Negative	Moderately Negative	Extremely Negative

17. Overall, what kind of an effect do you think nonhandicapped children will have on the handicapped child in the classroom?

A trainable mentally retarded child	Extremely Positive	Moderately Positive	Somewhat Positive	Somewhat Negative	Moderately Negative	Extremely Negative
Language delayed child	Extremely Positive	Moderately Positive	Somewhat Positive	Somewhat Negative	Moderately Negative	Extremely Negative
Physically handicapped child	Extremely Positive	Moderately Positive	Somewhat Positive	Somewhat Negative	Moderately Negative	Extremely Negative

18

18. Suppose you have a child with a handicap. How would you react if your handicapped child were placed in a regular classroom in a public school? Check one.

Physically handicapped child

____ I would remove my child from the class.
____ I would strongly object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would feel uncomfortable about my child being in such a class.
____ I wouldn't object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would be pleased if my child were placed in such a class.
____ I would transfer my child into such a class.

Language delayed child

____ I would remove my child from the class.
____ I would strongly object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would feel uncomfortable about my child being in such a class.
____ I wouldn't object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would be pleased if my child were placed in such a class.
____ I would transfer my child into such a class.

A trainable mentally retarded child

____ I would remove my child from the class.
____ I would strongly object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would feel uncomfortable about my child being in such a class.
____ I wouldn't object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would be pleased if my child were placed in such a class.
____ I would transfer my child into such a class.

19. How do you think you would feel if your nonhandicapped child were placed in a classroom in a public school that also had handicapped children in it? Check one.

A trainable mentally retarded child

____ I would remove my child from the class.
____ I would strongly object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would feel uncomfortable about my child being in such a class.
____ I wouldn't object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would be pleased if my child were placed in such a class.
____ I would transfer my child into such a class.

Physically handicapped child

____ I would remove my child from the class.
____ I would strongly object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would feel uncomfortable about my child being in such a class.
____ I wouldn't object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would be pleased if my child were placed in such a class.
____ I would transfer my child into such a class.

Language delayed child

____ I would remove my child from the class.
____ I would strongly object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would feel uncomfortable about my child being in such a class.
____ I wouldn't object to my child being in such a class.
____ I would be pleased if my child were placed in such a class.
____ I would transfer my child into such a class.

20. Please rate the usefulness of each of these possible resources in helping to teach handicapped children in the regular classroom.

Please put an "X" at any point on the line that best represents your opinion.

a. Availability of regular newsletter with information about the educational needs of special children.
   a. Very useful _____ Not useful at all

b. Availability of extra library materials.
   b. Very useful _____ Not useful at all

c. An aide or assistant teacher who works with you in the classroom on a regular basis.
   c. Very useful _____ Not useful at all

d. A resource teacher at your school who works directly with you and a small number of your students.
   d. Very useful _____ Not useful at all

e. Access to a computer connected typewriter at your school that will answer questions about what you should be doing with the special child.
   e. Very useful _____ Not useful at all

f. A bibliography of special resource materials available at the library.

f. Very useful _____ Not useful at all

g. A program specialist who visits your school regularly and advises you on a particular type of learning problem for retarded children.

g. Very useful _____ Not useful at all

21. Five types of educational arrangements are listed in the column on the right. Please write the letter of the educational arrangement you feel will best serve the needs of each group of children, listed on the appropriate line, on the left. You may use each response letter more than once.

____ children with mild learning disabilities
____ severely mentally retarded children
____ children with physical handicaps
____ autistic children
____ emotionally disturbed children
____ trainable mentally retarded children
____ children with hearing impairments
____ children with speech problems
____ children with visual handicaps

A. a separate, special school
B. a special school that shares a site with a regular school
C. a special classroom in a regular school
D. a classroom with both handicapped and non-handicapped children where the handicapped children receive some special assistance
E. a classroom where handicapped and nonhandicapped receive the same educational material

22. The handicapped child can function socially in the regular classroom.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
23. The teacher's attention will be more equally divided among the children if the class as a whole participates in activities rather than dividing the class into small independent groups.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
24. The teacher cannot assess the level of each child's skills (i.e., social, motor, etc.) if s/he stresses group activities.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
25. The teacher must be the focus of the child's attention in the classroom.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
26. Discipline and order must be maintained in the classroom.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
27. Playtime activities without real academic content take up too much time in the current classroom curricula.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

28. A child who is socially shy or physically "different" will make little progress in an unstructured classroom situation.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
29. Thinking and learning will be enhanced by exposure to a wide variety of materials, equipment, and activities.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
30. Parents should be directly involved in their child's education at school through parent volunteer programs.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
31. Young children do not have the capacity to "discover" things for themselves -- they need the teacher to show them "how" or "why."	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

32. How important are these values as classroom goals for the child?

Please put an "X" at any point on the line that best represents your opinion.

a.	Cooperation	a. Very important	Not important
b.	Courtesy	b. Very important	Not important
c.	Promptness	c. Very important	Not important
d.	Orderliness	d. Very important	Not important
e.	Individuality	e. Very important	Not important
f.	Creativeness	f. Very important	Not important
g.	A sense of wrong and right	g. Very important	Not important
h.	Independence	h. Very important	Not important
i.	Self-control	i. Very important	Not important
j.	Ability to work toward a goal	j. Very important	Not important
k.	Developing a sense of responsibility	k. Very important	Not important
l.	Curiosity	l. Very important	Not important
m.	Achievement motivation	m. Very important	Not important
n.	Ability to relate appropriately to adults	n. Very important	Not important
o.	Ability to interact with peers	o. Very important	Not important

33. The experiences that the young child has with his/her first classroom will profoundly affect his/her growth and attitude toward later schooling.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
34. One-to-one child/teacher interactions are more effective than teacher/group interactions.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
35. Making cognitive/intellectual gains are more important than establishing social competencies.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

36.	Free, expressive play is more important than the formal teaching of skills.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
37.	Only a trained therapist is qualified to administer physical, occupational or speech therapy to a child.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
38.	Only a specifically trained therapist can assess the progress a child is making in their particular area of difficulty.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
39.	The teacher's efforts should concentrate on developing a stimulating room environment.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
40.	The classroom environment should stimulate group rather than individual play.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
41.	Teacher defined classroom objectives. . . .						
	a. are too precise	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	b. are too general	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	c. can't be easily evaluated	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	d. results can't be applied in other situations	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
42.	The children can learn with little intervention from the teacher.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

43.	In order for maximum learning to occur, how much of the child's class time should be filled with activities planned by the teacher?	100% /	90% /	80% /	70% /	60% /	50% /	40% /	30% /	20% /	10% /	0% /
44.	In order for maximum learning to occur, how much of the child's class time should be planned by the child him/herself?	100% /	90% /	80% /	70% /	60% /	50% /	40% /	30% /	20% /	10% /	0% /

45. To what extent do the following characteristics define the teacher's role in the classroom?

Please put an "X" at any point on the line that best represents your opinion.

a.	Substitute parent	a. Very much _____	Not at all
b.	Supervisor	b. Very much _____	Not at all
c.	Helper-facilitator	c. Very much _____	Not at all
d.	Consultant	d. Very much _____	Not at all
e.	Passive observer	e. Very much _____	Not at all
f.	Center of attention	f. Very much _____	Not at all

46.	Invention and discovery cannot be utilized with young children.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
47.	Children should be passive receptors of information.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
48.	The goal for each child should be self-propelled, individualized learning.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
49.	If the teacher takes a passive role in the classroom, the children will become introverted and socially shy.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
50.	A good teacher doesn't require many materials to be used in demonstration.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
51.	Homework or take home projects are inappropriate.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
52.	Teaching machines have no place in our educational system.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
53.	If children do not participate in all the planned activities, the quality of the education they receive will differ.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
54.	The same educational methods that work in the regular classroom will work with children with handicaps.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
55.	The handicapped child can function academically in the regular classroom.	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

APPENDIX I

ADMINISTRATOR'S LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

CHILDREN'S SERVICES CENTER

A Division of Casa Colina Hospital of Rehabilitative Medicine

Hospital Accreditation:

Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals

Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitative Facilities

REHABILITATIVE SERVICES AND PROGRAMS FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES

Therapeutic Preschool

Diagnostic Evaluation

Pediatric Consultation

Family Guidance

Family Therapy

Outreach: Consultation to Schools

Parent Education

Infant Development

School Age Group Therapy

Professional Training

Community Referral

Dear School Administrators,

We have a Research Grant from the State Department of Education's Research Division (under the direction of Stuart Greenfeld), to conduct a survey on opinions about educational methods and techniques for handicapped children, between the ages of 3 and 6.

Our Grant includes provision for providing a $10 honorarium for all persons who return a questionnaire. We have drawn a stratified random sample of teachers, administrators and parents. It will take about forty minutes of your time, at your convenience.

A Research Assistant will deliver your questionnaire and be available to answer questions that you might have. Your name or program will not be identified with any of your answers. But a total report on the results will be sent to Mr. Greenfeld's office and disseminated through the California State Department of Education.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth M. Neumann

Elizabeth M. Neumann, Ph.D.
Project Director

EMN/jm

255 East Bonita Avenue, Pomona, California 91767 • Tel. (714) 593-7521

APPENDIX J

TEACHER'S LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

children's services center

A Division of Casa Colina Hospital of Rehabilitative Medicine

Hospital Accreditation:

Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals

Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitative Facilities

REHABILITATIVE SERVICES AND PROGRAMS FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES

Therapeutic Preschool

Diagnostic Evaluation

Pediatric Consultation

Family Guidance

Family Therapy

Outreach: Consultation to Schools

Parent Education

Infant Development

School Age Group Therapy

Professional Training

Community Referral

April 22, 1977

Dear Teacher:

We have a Research Grant from the State Department of Education's Research Division (under the direction of Stuart Greenfeld), to conduct a survey on opinions about educational methods and techniques for handicapped children, between the ages of 3 and 6.

Our Grant includes provision for providing a $10 honorarium for all persons who return a questionnaire. We have drawn a stratified random sample of teachers, administrators and parents. It will take about forty minutes of your time, at your convenience.

Your name or program will not be identified with any of your answers. But a total report on the results will be sent to Mr. Greenfeld's office and disseminated through the California State Department of Education.

We would also like to have a parent from your class fill out the parent questionnaire. Please RANDOMLY select one parent from your class to receive this questionnaire.

1. To RANDOMLY select, you can put all the children's names in a hat and draw one out (or you can put numbers in a hat and draw a number and use the name of the child who has that number in your roll book).

2. Ask the parent whether or not they would let us send them a questionnaire. Remind them that they will receive $10 and get a chance to have their opinions make some impact.

3. The parent questionnaire is enclosed.

4. Please return within 48 hours.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth M. Neumann

Elizabeth M. Neumann, Ph.D.
Project Director

EMN/vt

255 East Bonita Avenue, Pomona, California 91767 • Tel. (714) 593-7521

APPENDIX K

PARENT'S LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

CHILDREN'S SERVICES CENTER

A Division of Casa Colina Hospital of Rehabilitative Medicine

Hospital Accreditation:

Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals

Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitative Facilities

REHABILITATIVE SERVICES AND PROGRAMS FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES

Therapeutic Preschool

Diagnostic Evaluation

Pediatric Consultation

Family Guidance

Family Therapy

Outreach Consultation to Schools

Parent Education

Infant Development

School Age Group Therapy

Professional Training

Community Referral

Dear Parent,

We have a Research Grant from the State Department of Education's Research Division (under the direction of Stuart Greenfeld), to conduct a survey on opinions about educational methods and techniques for handicapped children, between the ages of 3 and 6.

Our Grant includes provision for providing a $10 honorarium for all persons who return a questionnaire. We have drawn a "stratified random sample of teachers and administrators." This means that we have taken specific types of schools; (for example: schools for the physically handicapped, regular private preschools, Head Starts, etc.) and then drawn names from within those groups.

We have asked each teacher, when possible, to draw a name from his/her class list, and to have a parent fill out one of the questionnaires. The parent will receive the same $10 honorarium that other participants receive. You have been selected to receive the questionnaire, and we would very much appreciate it if you could share your opinions and views with us. We feel that it will be a chance to really send your opinions to the State.

Your name or program, or your child's name, will not be identified with any of your answers. A final report based on the results of the study will be sent to Mr. Greenfeld's office and disseminated through the California State Department of Education.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth M. Neumann

Elizabeth M. Neumann, Ph.D.
Project Director

EMN:ach

Please return your questionnaire and envelope within 48 hours.

89

255 East Bonita Avenue, Pomona, California 91767 • Tel. (714) 593-7521

APPENDIX L

RESPONDENT THANK YOU LETTER

children's services center

A Division of Casa Colina Hospital of Rehabilitative Medicine

Hospital Accreditation:

Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals

Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitative Facilities

REHABILITATIVE SERVICES AND PROGRAMS FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AND THEIR FAMILIES

Therapeutic Preschool

Diagnostic Evaluation

Pediatric Consultation

Family Guidance

Family Therapy

Outreach Consultation to Schools

Parent Education

Infant Development

School Age Group Therapy

Professional Training

Community Referral

Dear (Study Participant):

We really appreciate your taking the time to complete the School Attitude Questionnaire, for our study.

The results of our study will be sent to the Research Branch of the State Department of Education, and copies of the final report will be available through them.

Thank you again for your time. We do feel that it is important to give the State Department of Education, and others interested, the benefit of the views and opinions of people like yourself who are concerned with the education of the young child.

Your honorarium check is enclosed.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth M. Neumann

Elizabeth M. Neumann, Ph.D.
Project Director

Christine Harris

Christine Harris, M.A.
Research Associate

EMN/CH:vt

Enclosure

255 East Bonita Avenue, Pomona, California 91767 • Tel. (714) 593-7521